NAG HAMMADI &
MANICHAEAN STUDIES

New Light on Manichaeism

Papers from the Sixth International Congress on Manichaeism

Edited by
JASON DAVID BEDUHN

BRILL

New Light on Manichaeism

Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies

Editors

Stephen Emmel & Johannes van Oort

Editorial Board

H. W. Attridge – R. Cameron – A. D. DeConick
W.-P. Funk – I. Gardner – C. W. Hedrick
S. N. C. Lieu – P. Nagel – B. A. Pearson
S. G. Richter – J. M. Robinson – K. Rudolph
M. Scopello – W. Sundermann – G. Wurst

VOLUME 64

New Light on Manichaeism

Papers from the Sixth International Congress on Manichaeism

Organized by
The International Association of Manichaean Studies

Edited by
Jason David BeDuhn

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2009

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

International Conference on Manichaeism (6th : 2005 : Flagstaff, Ariz.)
New light on Manichaeism : papers from the sixth International Congress on Manichaeism ; organized by the International Association of Manichaean Studies / edited by Jason David BeDuhn.
p. cm. — (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies)
Includes index.
ISBN 978-90-04-17285-2 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Manichaeism—Congresses. I. BeDuhn, Jason. II. Title. III. Series.

BT1410.158 2005
299'.932—dc22

2008050516

ISSN 0929-2470
ISBN 978 90 04 17285 2

Copyright 2009 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

Dedicated to
Werner Sundermann
wzyšt srtw'

CONTENTS

List of Plates ix
Preface xi

A Religion of Deeds: Scepticism in the Doctrinally Liberal Manichaeism of Faustus and Augustine 1
Jason David BeDuhn

The Conversation of John the Orthodox with a Manichaean: An Analysis of Its Sources and Its Significance for Manichaean Studies 29
Byard Bennett

The Mani Logion: "The purification that was spoken about is that which comes through gnosis" (CMC 84, 9–12) 45
Luigi Cirillo

Manichaeism Among the Uygurs: The Uygur Khan of the Bokug Clan 61
Larry Clark

Manichaean Time-Management: Laymen between Religious and Secular Duties 73
Iris Colditz

Characteristics of Manichaeism in Roman Africa 101
J. Kevin Coyle

Mani's Account of Other Religions According to the Coptic *Synaxeis* Codex 115
Wolf-Peter Funk

How We Know the Exact Year the Archegos Left Baghdad ... 129
Cyril Glassé

An Experiment in Digital Reconstruction with a Manichaean Book Painting: *The Work of the Religion Scene* (MIK III 4974 recto) 145
Zsuzsanna Gulácsi

The Manichaean Church between Earth and Paradise 169
Claudia Leurini

Medieval Manichaean and Nestorian Remains in the Zayton (Quanzhou) of Marco Polo 181
Samuel N. C. Lieu

Sukhāvatī and the Light-world: Pure Land Elements in the Chinese Manichaean *Eulogy of the Light-world* 201
Gunner Mikkelsen

ʿymyn ʾʾhynd: The Beginning of Mani's Psalm *Wuzurgān Āfrīwan* in Parthian and Middle Persian 213
Enrico Morano

A Sogdian Version of Mani's *Letter of the Seal* 225
Christiane Reck

Snatches of the Middle Iranian "Tale of the Five Brothers" ... 241
Christiane Reck

A Manichaean Collection of Letters and a List of Mani's Letters in Middle Persian 259
Werner Sundermann

Plates

Index 279

LIST OF PLATES

The plates can be found following page 278.

Pl. 1 & Figs. 1–10 belong to the article 'An Experiment in Digital Reconstruction with a Manichaean Book Painting: The Work of the Religion Scene *(MIK III 4974 recto)' by Z. Gulácsi*:

Pl. 1. *The Work of the Religion Scene* (MIK III 4794 recto, detail) before and after Digital Reconstruction (actual size: 6.6 cm × 6.1 cm).

Figs. 1a–d. Reconstruction Outline of a Turfan Manichaean Illuminated Codex Folio, MIK III 4974 (after Gulacsi 2005, Fig. 5/8).

Fig. 2. *The Bema Scene.* Full-page book painting on MIK III 4949 verso, shown from picture-viewing direction. Reconstruction Line Drawing of a Turfan Manichaean Bookpainting (after Ebert 1994, Fig. 3).

Fig. 3. *The Work of the Religion Scene*. Intracolumnar book-painting on MIK III 4974 verso, shown from picture-viewing direction (after Gulacsi 2001a, Fig. 36.1). Division of Image into Sections to be Reconstructed.

Figs. 4a–c. Reconstruction of Section 1 (Footed Bowl with Figs).

Figs. 5a–c. Reconstruction of Section 2 (Laymen Holding Books).

Figs. 6a–c. Reconstruction of Section 3a (Heads of Male Elects).

Figs. 7a–c. Reconstruction of Section 3b (Body of Male Elects).

Figs. 8a–c. Reconstruction of Section 4 (Gesturing Left Hand of Elect).

Figs. 9a–c. Reconstruction of Section 5 (Vessels of Light).

Figs. 10a–c. Reconstruction of Section 6 (Hand of God).

Pls. 1 & 2 belong to the article 'Medieval Manichaean and Nestorian Remains in the Zayton (Quanzhou) of Marco Polo' by S. N. C. Lieu:

Pl. 1. The Manichaean shrine (*cao'an*) at Huabiao Hill in 2003. (Photograph taken by Ms. Michelle Wilson, official photographer, Macquarie University).

Pl. 2. The statue of Mani the Buddha of Light inside the shrine. (Photograph taken by Ms. Michelle Wilson, official photographer, Macquarie University).

Pls. 1–4 belong to the article '‘ymyn ”hynd: *The Beginning of Mani's Psalm* Wuzurgān Āfrīwan *in Parthian and Middle Persian*' *by E. Morano*:

Pl. 1. M608/R & M895/R (Photo: Fotostelle der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz).
Pl. 2. Ch/So20501/V/ + Ch/U6546/V/ (Photo: Fotostelle der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz).
Pl. 3. M379b/R/(right) (Photo: Fotostelle der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz).
Pl. 4. M379b/V/(left) (Photo: Fotostelle der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz).

Pls. 1–4 belong to the article '*A Sogdian Version of Mani's* Letter of the Seal' *by C. Reck*:

Pl. 1. 1st bifolio (Photo: Berlin State Library).
Pl. 2. 2nd bifolio (Photo: Berlin State Library).
Pl. 3. 3rd bifolio (Photo: Berlin State Library).
Pl. 4. M 1313–M 1312 (Photo: Berlin State Library).

Pls. 1–2 belong to the article 'Snatches of the Middle Iranian "'Tale of the Five Brothers"' by C. Reck:

Pl. 1. So 18058 + So 18197r (Photo: Berlin State Library).
Pl. 2. So 18058 + So 18197v (Photo: Berlin State Library).

Pls. 1–9 belong to the article 'A Manichaean Collection of Letters and a List of Mani's Letters in Middle Persian' by W. Sundermann:

Pl. 1. So 15502/v/.
Pl. 2. M 5770 + M 5771 – M 5772 + M 6604/p.1/.
Pl. 3. M 5770 + M 5771 – M 5772 + M 6604/p.2/.
Pl. 4. M 501p – M 882c + M 1402 + M 9152/p.1/.
Pl. 5. M 501p – M 882c + M 1402 + M 9152/p.2/.
Pl. 6. M 6935/p.1/.
Pl. 7. M 6935/p.2/.
Pl. 8. M 6944/p.1/.
Pl. 9. M 6944/p.2/.

PREFACE

The contributions contained in this volume represent research presented at the Sixth International Congress on Manichaean Studies, held under the auspices of the International Association of Manichaean Studies, and under the presidency of Prof. Dr. Johannes van Oort. The IAMS has organized a number of conferences and symposia over the last two decades, including five previous international congresses in Lund, Bonn, Rende-Amantea, Berlin, and Naples. At the latter meeting, held in 2001, the Executive Board of the association brought forward a recommendation that the next international congress be held in North America in 2005. The recommendation was enthusiastically endorsed by the membership of the association and I, just elected as the first North American member of the Executive Board, was given the portfolio of congress convener, an assignment I imagine was in mind when I was nominated for election.

For those of us laboring in Manichaean studies in North America, this development was received as an acknowledgment of our place in the larger field, in which European scholars have unquestionably played the predominant role. The roll call of honor of those who have preceded us in this area of research includes only one major American figure: Abraham Valentine Williams Jackson. Otherwise, Manichaean studies in North America is very much an endeavor of the current generation. So it was with Jackson's own hand-annotated copy of F. C. Baur's *Das manichäische Religionssystem* close at hand on my shelf that I assumed responsibility for organizing the Sixth International Conference of Manichaean Studies in Flagstaff, Arizona, on the campus of Northern Arizona University.

My flight back from Naples with this charge was marred by the events of September 11th, 2001, which diverted the plane back to Europe for several days. Some of the lesser consequences of that tragedy still burdened travel to the United States in 2005, along with the inevitable expense of travel much further for European scholars than that to which they had been accustomed by the closer venues of prior meetings. The result was a somewhat smaller gathering in Flagstaff compared to previous congresses; but this only fostered the more intimate environment of a symposium, enjoyed not only in the relaxed and

lengthy exchanges that followed each paper, but also in the handful of excursions that punctuated the proceedings.

It should be mentioned that the founding president of the IAMS, Prof. Dr. Kurt Rudolph, was among those in attendance at the meeting. It was Prof. Rudolph, visiting Harvard University in the mid-1980s when I was pursuing a master's degree there, who more than anyone else drew me into and encouraged me in the area of Manichaean studies, as I have already indicated in dedicating my first book to him and to his colleague at Harvard, Richard Frye, Aga Khan Professor of Iranian Studies, Emeritus. It was in pursuit of the Iranian side of this subject in which Prof. Frye gave me my start that I entered into a world of scholarship of which one man was the master, and the rest of us mere pupils. I am speaking, of course, of Prof. Dr. Werner Sundermann, who brings to his own superlative erudition a profound humility and untiring nurturance of younger researchers. It has been my great privilege over the last decade and a half to experience first-hand the pleasure of his insight, his patience, and his friendship, extended without hesitation to me when I must have presented to many the appearance of a brash upstart. It is my conviction that his constant endeavor to bridge philological analysis and historical study of religion shows the necessary way forward for the caravan of Manichaean studies. As philologists, we have not always been attuned to the peculiarities of the religious use of language where words are subordinated to the practices in which they are employed; and, as historians of religion, we have not always permitted texts to defy our expectations or prior assumptions of what a religion stands for or takes as important. But we are learning, as I think the contributions to this volume show.

Sitting around a table one afternoon amid the red rocks of Sedona, Prof. Sundermann asked me what I would call this volume, noting the common theme running through the titles of my previous editorial efforts for the Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies series (those prior projects co-edited with Prof. Paul Mirecki): *Emerging from Darkness* and *The Light and the Darkness*. On the spot, an almost too-easy answer came to me: *New Light on Manichaeism*. I thought it an appropriate title for a collection of the very latest discoveries and insights into this vital and growing field of research, which was what I was hearing at the congress sessions, and which is what you hold in your hands. I am grateful to Brill Publishers for their willingness to include this volume in the NHMS series, and wish to particularly thank Prof. Dr. Johannes

van Oort, series editor of NHMS as well as IAMS President, for his meticulous oversight of the project.

A variety of circumstances prevented the proceedings of the congress from being fully represented in this volume. I wish to thank all those who participated, in whatever form, in the undertaking. Everyone pitched in with the mundane tasks that accompany such a meeting, making my work as organizer easier, and more of an excuse for spending time with my colleagues beyond the limits of scholarly exchange. Most especially I wish to thank my beloved wife, Zsuzsanna Gulácsi, for her quiet partnership in this endeavor.

Jason BeDuhn
Flagstaff

A RELIGION OF DEEDS: SCEPTICISM IN THE DOCTRINALLY LIBERAL MANICHAEISM OF FAUSTUS AND AUGUSTINE

Jason David BeDuhn
Flagstaff

The story from Augustine's *Confessions* is well known. The young Augustine, enthralled by Manichaeism but having difficulty with some of its apparent contradictions with the science of the time, is told to await Faustus, who will solve everything for him. When Faustus finally does arrive, Augustine finds that he does not measure up to expectations. Despite a sharp mind, a ready rhetorical wit, and an affable nature, he simply is not intellectually equipped to mentor Augustine in the technical questions that plagued him. Ironically, it is Faustus who turns to Augustine for mentoring in literature. Finally disabused by this experience from his trust in Manichaeism, Augustine starts down the path that will bring him to Catholicism, with Faustus playing an unwitting role in helping to bring about his ultimate salvation (*Conf.* 5.7.13).

This tidy little tale from book 5 of the *Confessions* marks a key turning point in the plot, and is an important part of what makes the *Confessions* a literary classic. But the story is also misleading in a number of respects. As is often the case in such situations, the original author is only partly to blame. On top of Augustine's own deliberate reworking of events for dramatic and ideological effect have been layered readings which are less fair to Faustus and Manichaeism than even Augustine was, readings which further accentuate the brilliance of the Catholic saint at the expense of what are regarded as the empty boasts and promises of heretics with really nothing to offer. What is missing from these readings is context: the context of Faustus's Manichaeism and his attitude towards Augustine's concerns, the context of Augustine's own expectations and inclinations, the context of what Faustus actually contributed to Augustine in ways Augustine could not always recognize or acknowledge, given his position as an embattled Catholic bishop. Fortunately, we have at hand the material needed to supply this context, both from Augustine's other writings and from Faustus's pen.

Re-reading Faustus within this necessary context significantly changes how we think of his role in North African Manichaeism and in permanently shaping the mind of his most famous pupil, Augustine.

The Manichaean Appeal to Reason

In the marketplace of competing faiths, and rival interpretations and applications of Christianity,[1] North African Manichaeans presented themselves as men (and women) of reason, known to Augustine for their motto of "Truth, and truth alone!" (*Conf.* 3.6.10). He tells us that, "They urged no one to believe until the truth was fully discussed and proved" (*Util. cred.* 1.2), and that they taught a general scepticism of accepting ideas on authority. No one should be forced to assent to teaching merely because someone in authority says so. Such an attitude greatly appealed to the young Augustine, fresh from reading Cicero's *Hortensius* with its call to the free life of the mind—a call echoed in Cicero's sceptical manifesto, *Academica*. François Decret has shown how the Manichaeans' rationalist program contextualizes Augustine's description of his own qualified commitment to Manichaeism. Augustine says that he withheld total assent to its teachings while he awaited full disclosure of the system. He had taken up Manichaeism because it taught by an open-minded, progressive instruction, rather than command faith as an all-or-nothing, once-and-for-all commitment prior to having the system explained (*Beat. vit.* 1.4).[2]

If the Manichaean claim to reason had been a completely misleading front, Augustine would scarcely have remained with them for more than nine years. It seems that quite early in the Manichaean mission in the Roman Empire its rhetoric was informed by the sceptical-dogmatic debate in Hellenistic philosophy. Manichaean texts from the region always employ the term *dogmata* pejoratively, to refer to the false views of other sects and schools. The Manichaeans in this way positioned themselves as the proponents of reason in the face of dogmatic authority, taking up the language, if not the actual positions, of scepticism as it was propounded in the literature of the Pyrrhonic and Academic

---

[1] On Manichaeism as a member of the family of late antique Christianities, see Johannes van Oort, "Manichäismus," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Band V (Tübingen, 2002), 732–741.

[2] F. Decret, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine* (Paris, 1970), 33.

schools. The latter schools set themselves apart from all other philosophies where opinions (the original meaning of *dogmata*) are asserted. Of course, Manichaeism is by no means a sceptical system, asserting as it does absolute truths, and making direct appeal to the authority of Mani and Jesus. Rather, it employed sceptical techniques as a tactic in polemics, while in establishing the foundations of its own system it used other forms of reason alongside of arguments from authority. So we need to understand exactly what shape the Manichaean appeal to reason took as Augustine encountered and—for a time—appreciated it.

From texts as far afield as China, we know that Manichaeism everywhere instructed its missionaries to begin with an argument for dualism. Without a foundation in the two principles of good and evil, there could be no conviction in the other Manichaean teachings, and consequently no rootedness for the practice of the religion.[3] As materialists, the Manichaeans gravitated towards inductive methods of argument and reasoning. One reasons to the existence of the two principles from observations about oppositions within the material world and ourselves. For example, the Manichaean Fortunatus argues that, "Because it is a fact that we do sin against our wills…for this reason, we seek out a knowledge of the reason of things" (*C. Fort.* 20), leading to a dualistic conclusion.[4]

Augustine's later attacks on Manichaean materialism involve an assault on such an inductive method of reasoning, which, because it works from the observed world up to first principles, is imprisoned within materialistic conceptions of reality and inevitably casts the first principles it finds in the material mold. He was able to dust off anti-materialist criticisms formerly employed against Stoicism, and use them to good effect against the similarly-oriented Manichaean world view. A critique of inductivism is also involved in his contention that Manichaean dualism is a projection onto the cosmos of mere personal preference, since the process of proving dualism starts with the reactions of the individual to human experience (*C. Faust.* 32.20).

---

[3] See *Compendium*, section 6 (É. Chavannes and Paul Pelliot, "Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine (Deuxième partie)," *Journal Asiatique* 1913, 114.

[4] To the degree that we are able to reconstruct it, it appears that Augustine's first composition, the *De pulchro et apto*, follows such an inductive line of inquiry: observation, abstraction, contemplation; see Kam-lun Edwin Lee, *Augustine, Manichaeism, and the Good*, Patristic Studies 2 (New York, 1999), 24–25.

Manichaeans themselves recognized the limits of reason. Reason can provide the necessary dualistic foundation for belief, they believed, but it cannot supply all the revealed details of the faith. Faustus explains that some types of knowledge are not discoverable by reason per se. For example, "arguments and necessary consequences are not applicable to those matters where the question is of the account to be given of Jesus," that is, historical rather than metaphysical truth. Reason cannot tell us what Jesus could or could not have said or done. Reason only applies to such matters in so far as one is assessing the validity of sources—whether they are in a good position to know whereof they speak—not what they contain. "The answer must be obtained from his own statements, or from the statements of his apostles regarding him" (*C. Faust.* 28.1). So the Manichaeans "promise the knowledge of indubitable things," which amounts to proven certainty of the core principle of dualism, and on the basis of that rational foundation of certainty expect "faith in doubtful things" within the fully elaborated Manichaean system (*C. epist. fund.* 14.17). In other words, "You say . . . that you believe in what Manichaeus has not proved, because he has so clearly proved the existence of two natures, good and evil, in this world" (*C. Faust.* 32.20). Mani has been established as a reliable authority by his correctness about those things accessible to reason and proof. For matters beyond such means of proof, one has little choice but to adhere to some such authority whose reliability has been established in those areas where proofs by observation and experience are possible.

The term scepticism, therefore, may only be used with qualification in connection with Manichaeism generally, or even North African Manichaeism specifically. While employing sceptical rhetoric and even occasional argument against the *dogmata* of their opponents, Manichaeans were by no means strict adherents of any sceptical philosophy. Scepticism was for them not a general epistemological position, despite deep reservations about the reliability of the senses. Rather, it was primarily a tool to be used against other religions that relied upon authority to hold positions that, from the Manichaean point of view, contradicted direct observations about the nature of the world.

Faustus's Pragmatic Program

With the historical material on Faustus we have access to a real individual, and we are able to talk for once not about Manichaeans in the abstract, but about a particular Manichaean with specificity. He was in

many respects the embodiment of the rational values that characterized the self-presentation of North African Manichaeism.[5] Faustus rejects the idea of "believing without the use of judgment and reason," and lays claim to "rational blessedness" over the "blind blessedness" of the Catholics (*C. Faust.* 16.8). Claims made in the Bible "must be tested to find out whether they are true, sound, and genuine" by the "use of reason, which is the prerogative of human nature" (*C. Faust.* 18.3).

On the one hand, this test of truth is based in the certain inductive truth of dualism. Faustus declares that the authenticity of the record of Christ's teaching in the gospels is confirmed by its conformity to dualist truth arrived at by reason (*C. Faust.* 32.7). Manichaeism is set apart from all other religions by its recognition of the dualist nature of reality, he argues, so objective confirmation of that latter reality identifies Manichaeism as the only religion rooted in truth. On the other hand, the test of truth is for Faustus a practical one, involving assessing whether a concept serves to build up an authentically Christian—and that means Manichaean—way of life.

In his *Capitula*, Faustus sets forth the thesis that religion is defined primarily by practice, rather than belief. Commitment to a particular religion entails enactment of its precepts and living the life its teachings dictate—nothing more and nothing less. To believe is to do. Anything else is hypocrisy. The Catholics are hypocrites, he asserts, for laying claim to the Old Testament while not even trying to live according to its precepts. The Old Testament makes its promises to those who act in accordance with its commands (*C. Faust.* 4.1). By the same principle, Faustus lays claim to the legacy of Christ not by believing certain things but by acting according to his precepts.

> Do I believe the gospel? You ask me if I believe it, though my obedience to its commands shows that I do. I should rather ask you if you believe it, since you give no proof of your belief. I have left my father, mother, wife, and children, and all else that the gospel requires; and do you ask if I believe the gospel? Perhaps you do not know what is called the gospel. The gospel is nothing else than the preaching and the precept of Christ. I have parted with all gold and silver, and have left off carrying money in my purse; content with daily food; without anxiety for tomorrow; and without solicitude about how I shall be fed, or wherewithal I shall be clothed: and do you ask if I believe the gospel? You see in me the blessings of the gospel; and do you ask if I believe the gospel? You

[5] Decret, *Aspects*, 67.

> see me poor, meek, a peacemaker, pure in heart, mourning, hungering, thirsting, bearing persecutions and enmity for righteousness' sake; and do you doubt my belief in the gospel? (*C. Faust.* 5.1)

The moral disciplines of the beatitudes constitute the gospel for Faustus.[6] He is able to demonstrate that Jesus clearly expresses the same practice-centered commitment. When asked by John the Baptist if he was the Christ, he "properly and justly did not deign to reply that he was; but reminded him of the works of which he had already heard." Faustus goes on to quote a catena of passages in which Christ praises and promises heavenly reward to those who do, act, fulfill, and undertake (*C. Faust.* 5.3).

Therefore, "belief in the gospel consists solely in obedience to the commands of God" (*C. Faust.* 5.2). Faustus criticizes the Catholic emphasis on belief over practice, and particularly belief in certain dogmas, such as the Incarnation, that he regards as entirely unrelated to explaining and justifying the way of life Christ teaches (*C. Faust.* 5.2). For the sake of argument, Faustus is willing to admit that the exact character of the Incarnation is an open question, and might very well turn out to be as the Catholics say it is, but this scarcely justifies focusing on such a point of belief to the exclusion of actually following the commandments of Christ, over which there is no doubt whatsoever. Even if belief and practice are complementary parts of religion, those who stress practice take the more difficult part than those who merely believe while neglecting practice. He criticizes the Catholics for their belief that "confessing that Christ was born has more power to save the soul than the other parts" of the Christian religious system (*C. Faust.* 5.2). Implicit in Faustus's emphasis is the idea that details of doctrine are not as important as a system of practice rooted in a plausible general account of the nature of things.

Faustus's attitude fits within a pattern general to Manichaeism. Doctrine is adaptable, practice conservatively maintained.[7] Was Faustus acting consciously on his awareness of a specific policy among the Manichaeans to prioritize practice over doctrine? Where did he learn to take this approach to his religion? We know that Faustus expressly declares himself a follower of Adda, the pioneer missionary of Manichaeism in the Roman west (*C. Faust.* 1.2). The few fragmentary Manichaean texts

---

[6] *C. Faust.* 5.1: Vides in me Christi beatitudines illas, quae euangelium faciunt.
[7] See J. BeDuhn, *The Manichaean Body: In Discipline and Ritual* (Baltimore, 2000).

we have on Adda emphasize his study of the philosophical and religious systems of the west, and his work to refute "all dogmas."[8] Adda was almost certainly the one who formulated Manichaean terminology in the western milieu, including the adoption of sceptical rhetoric. Criticizing the Bible and challenging Christian dogma would put Faustus in continuity with this tradition of Adda, just as African Manichaeism was generally.

But what may be simply a tendency of the Manichaean tradition before him becomes for Faustus a self-conscious program. While noting the reason-based proof of dualism, he gives most attention to a second basis for trust in Mani, namely, the proof from moral outcome. In *Confessions* 5.5.9, Augustine recollects that the mode of life lived by Mani himself and established by his teachings was put forward as a reason to believe in those teachings that Augustine found compelling, despite doubts raised by his comparison of them to astronomical literature. He was inclined to trust Mani's word, "by reason of the credit given to his holiness." Where reason cannot supply a certain answer, the moral argument steps in.[9] Preaching to a Christian audience, Faustus put this argument in the form of a pragmatic proof of consistency between Mani and Christ in their respective precepts of action. Christ taught us to lead a certain life; Manichaeans followed that way of life. If their implementation of practice was right, the argument went, then it followed that their interpretation of doctrine was right. Faustus says, for instance, that whether the Manichaeans or the Catholics are right about the exact nature of Christ's incarnation, it is the Manichaeans who live the Christian life, and that life is unaffected by any shortfall on doctrinal points unrelated to practice. So Faustus is even willing to question Manichaean dogma, to admit that he cannot be sure of some parts of it (e.g., astronomy, incarnation) by reason alone. For him, these are matters of indifference, *adiaphora* besides the essentials of Manichaean practice, whose evident morality is proof enough that it rests on a sound basis in truth.

When we return to Augustine's autobiographical narrative in light of the context of Faustus' particular attitudes as expressed in his *Capitula*, we find reason to question the traditional reading of Augustine's

[8] See the fragmentary accounts of Adda's activities collected in Werner Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*, Berliner Turfantexte 11 (Berlin, 1981), lines 170–187 (text 2.5), 346–358 (text 3.1), 450–480 (text 3.3).

[9] Decret, *Aspects*, 35–36.

representation of his Manichaean mentor. Augustine found himself, after nearly a decade as a Manichaean, struggling with scientific challenges to Manichaean cosmology regarding the movements of the stars and planets. Augustine tells us not just that Faustus lacked the background to address these issues, he adds and emphasizes that Faustus was not interested in even trying to address them. He showed no interest at all in trying to resolve these questions. They simply were not essential to either the basic dualistic premise or the precepts of Manichaeism. For Augustine, on the other hand, if any detail of Mani's teaching was in error, the whole construct must be called into question. Augustine hungered for Truth, not a code of ethics or a ritual system. He demanded a body of knowledge absolutely certain in its every detail, and for that reason capable of being invested with total confidence. Faustus, expressing a more sceptical bent, was unconcerned to verify every pronouncement of Mani or Adda on the authenticity of a verse of scripture, the exact nature of Christ's embodiment, or the causative forces of celestial motion. What mattered for him was the overall ethos of the religion, its compelling character as a value system, and its plausibility as a means of salvation.

Faustus's Adoption of Academic Scepticism

Faustus went well beyond the general appeal to reason found in Manichaeism. He adopted the reality of scepticism, not just its rhetoric. He reveals to us a public character rooted not just in reason, but in the specific outlook of scepticism, questioning all tradition and authority, and claiming liberty of conscience free of all dogma.[10] He makes little effort in his public tracts to expound Manichaean doctrine beyond its dualist foundation and the practical consequences of that foundation in the formation of a moral human being. Details of Mani's exposition appear less important than its basic thrust, and Faustus even expresses an implicit criticism of many of his Manichaean forebears: only Adda has a claim to be a respected thinker by Faustus's standards (*C. Faust.* 1.2). While we might imagine that the nature of apologetic and polemical exchange has shaped how Faustus presents himself in his *Capitula*, Augustine attests a Faustus working in substantially the same terms in

[10] Decret, *Aspects*, 69.

private: disinterested in engaging in discussion of the details of Manichaean cosmogony and cosmology even with a relatively veteran and knowledgeable auditor such as Augustine. Faustus appears to have raised the stakes of the Manichaean appeal to reason by combining the Manichaean emphasis on practice over belief with a more consistent application of sceptical principles. Knowing this puts Augustine's account of his experiences with Faustus in a wholly new light.

We are in a position to identify the source of Faustus's connection to the sceptical tradition. Augustine tells us that Faustus was familiar with the works of Cicero (*Conf.* 5.6.11), and such familiarity shows in Faustus's own manner of argument. Academic scepticism pervades Cicero's work, and it may even have been through Faustus that Augustine was exposed to the specific Ciceronian text on which he depends for the exposition of Academic scepticism in his own *Contra* or *De Academicos*,[11] namely, Cicero's *Academica*. Others before me have suggested that in making his first non-Manichaean composition a critique of Academic scepticism, Augustine must have in some obscure way been addressing his Manichaean past.[12] But no consensus has been reached on precisely how the two traditions intersect. I propose that Faustus himself is the key, the missing link between Manichaeism and scepticism that is hinted at throughout Augustine's works. Manichaeism is not a sceptical tradition, but Faustus is a sceptical individual, and as an individual had a powerful influence on Augustine against which he later reacted.

The Ciceronian scepticism to which Faustus had been exposed was of a particular kind, dependent on the Platonic New Academy of Carneades, Clitomachus, and Philo of Larissa. Of all the varieties of sceptical thought in Hellenistic philosophy, only that of the New Academy followed by Cicero was compatible with Faustus's Manichaean emphasis on practice. The scepticism of Carneades and Philo of Larissa was formulated with reasonably justified action in mind.[13] Indeed, it was claimed that the Academic is the only sort of philosopher that does not rest in otiose contemplation of dogmatic truth already obtained, but

[11] On Augustine's own uncertainties as to whether his own work was more properly *de* or *contra*, see *Retr.* 1.1; *Ep.* 1.

[12] I return to these prior discussions below.

[13] Carneades had introduced the idea that action is still justified for the sceptic in that he or she is able to determine what is plausible (*pithanon*, *probabile*), that is what seems to be true (*veri simile*, apparently a coinage of Cicero). Even though a person cannot be sure that it is true, it is sufficiently plausible or truth-like to act upon.

constantly strives for truth.[14] The Academic sage stands in possession of "discovered probabilities" that form a body of knowledge on which one may act (Alypius in *C. Acad.* 3.3.5; cf. 2.12.27). The sage acts according to what is plausibly so; he does not deny reality but rather certainty about reality (*Acad. pr.* 2.32.104–105).[15] The Academic sceptic does not deny the existence of true reality, but only objects to the claimed human capacity to infallibly recognize it (*Acad. pr.* 2.34.111).[16]

Just as Faustus subordinates doctrine to practice, so Cicero emphasized that Academic scepticism was practice-centered, that all assessment of what may be true was geared towards directing conduct.[17] Cicero, following in particular Philo, justifies the ability to assess and progress in reasoning inductively by appeal to an innate grasp of things, an inner sense of right and wrong that underlies human common sense (*Tusc. disp.* 3.1.2; *De finibus* 5.21.59).[18] Faustus asserts the same sort of innate sense as the foundation of reasoning: "In reading the Gospels, the clear intention of our heart perceives the errors, and, to avoid all

---

[14] Cicero, *Acad. pr.* 2.3.7–8: "For even though many difficulties hinder every branch of knowledge, and both the subjects themselves and our faculties of judgment involve such a lack of certainty that the most ancient and learned thinkers had good reason for distrusting their ability to discover what they desired, nevertheless they did not give up, nor yet will we abandon in exhaustion our zeal for research.... [W]e hold many doctrines as probable, which we can easily act upon but can scarcely advance as certain."

[15] The key is the ability to proceed with action without meeting a refutation of what is deemed plausibly true (*Acad. pr.* 2.33–34.107–109).

[16] This seems to reflect the development of Philo of Larissa, Cicero's teacher, who unlike Carneades did not reject ontological truth and reality, but only our ability to directly perceive it. Philo thus keeps the "plausible" from being meaningless, in that it does indeed refer to a reality, however masked by the limitations of our knowing (whereas Carneades would not concede even this). Philo affirms an objectively existing truth which is not subjectively reachable. On the occlusion of the senses, see *Acad. pr.* 2.23.73, 2.25.79–81.

[17] Cicero, *Acad. pr.* 2.10.32: The Academics "hold that something is plausible [*probabile*] and in a way 'truth-like' [*veri simile*], and that they employ this as a guide [*regula*] both in the conduct of life and in investigation and discussion"; *Acad. pr.* 2.31.99: "The wise man will therefore employ whatever is apparently plausible if nothing happens that is contrary to that plausibility, and his whole plan of life will be governed in this fashion." Compare Augustine, *C. Acad.* 2.7.19–2.8.20.

[18] Cicero suggests that Philo of Larissa believed in an innate instinct to truth, a truth *impressum in animo atque in mente* (*Acad. pr.* 2.11.34). Cicero says that we have the "innate seed" of the virtues (*Tusc. disp.* 3.1.2) as well as "embryonic notions of the loftiest ideas" (*De finibus* 5.21.59). This justifies trust in our own instincts and in common sense. Cicero held that belief in God and in the immortality of the soul were likewise inherent in all humankind. On this subject, see Harold Tarrant, "Agreement and the Self-Evident in Philo of Larissa," *Dionysius* 5 (1981): 89–97.

injustice, we accept whatever is useful…while we reject the rest" (*C. Faust.* 32.2). This innateness is grounded for both Cicero and Faustus in a common notion of the soul's divine nature.[19]

Faustus makes use of the three principles of Carneades for determining the probable on which to act, as reported by Sextus Empiricus, *Adv. math.* 7.166, and by Cicero, *Acad. pr.* 2.11.33: (1) the *pithanon* (persuasive), (2) the non-contradicted, (3) the tested. In his acceptance of Mani's core teaching of dualism, he adopts that which is persuasive. When he declares both the validity of that dualism and the authenticity of the record of Christ's teaching based on their mutual agreement, he applies the principle of the non-contradicted (*C. Faust.* 32.7), as he does when he argues that we know the correct interpretation of Jesus' sayings when such an interpretation agrees with what Jesus actually did in practice (*C. Faust.* 17.2). In confirming the truth of Mani's ideas by their ability to produce or sustain ethical conduct, and the falsity of the Jewish Law by the conduct of those who followed it according to the testimony of their own scripture, he makes use of the principle of practical testing (*C. Faust.* 12.1).

Moreover, the Academy offered the only break with the Stoic model of action that made room for the Manichaean complication of human agency. The almost universally accepted Stoic model maintained that human action amounts to an automatic reaction to a perception. Mental assent to a "presentation" of the senses triggers an immediate motive to act. Sinful conduct can result, therefore, only from misperception of that which is "presented" (see *Acad. pr.* 2.11.33). The Academics, on the other hand, sought to open up a space between presentations and the reactions they trigger, to perform "an almost Herculean labor in ridding our minds of that fierce wild beast, the act of assent" (*Acad. pr.* 2.11.34) in order to conform conduct to the mind's willful self-determination. This nascent concept of the will had been all but forgotten until revived by the Manichaeans and introduced through figures such as Faustus and Fortunatus to Augustine.

---

[19] "Whatever it is that is conscious, that is wise, that lives, that is active must be heavenly and divine and for that reason eternal. And indeed God himself, who is comprehended by us, can be comprehended in no other way save as a mind unfettered and free, severed from all perishable matter, conscious of all and moving all and self-endowed with perpetual motion. Of such sort and of the same nature is the human mind" (*Tusc. disp.* 1.27.66).

Faustus's apparent concession to Augustine that Mani could be wrong about certain cosmological details (*Conf.* 5.7.12), and his similar demurral regarding Mani's position on the Incarnation (*C. Faust.* 5.2–3) demonstrates his adherence to the uniquely Academic position that the sage (e.g., Mani) can occasionally take erroneous positions due to the epistemological limitations of human existence (Cicero, *Acad. pr.* 2.11.36; 2.18.59). Faustus declined to defend Mani's views against Augustine's astronomical data, and dismissed questions so remote from the pragmatics of the religion as unimportant. In doing so, he appears to follow closely the specific argument of Cicero in *Academica* where, by comparing and contrasting the various rival cosmologies of the day, he concludes that it is impossible to affirm one over another (*Acad. pr.* 2.36.116ff.). Cicero says that the sage is not forced to answer all the riddles of the universe (*Acad. pr.* 2.38.119–120). Faustus seems to have taken this liberty to heart, particularly in dealing with an auditor such as Augustine, whose obsession with cosmology distracted him from a zealous commitment to Manichaean morality and ritual practices. He likely saw his justification in the distinction Cicero made between practical and theoretical questions:

> For if a question be put to him about duty or about a number of other matters in which practice has made him an expert, he would not reply in the same way as he would if questioned as to whether the number of the stars is even or odd, and say that he did not know;[20] for in things uncertain there is nothing probable, but in things where there is probability the wise man will not be at a loss either what to do or what to answer. (*Acad. pr.* 2.34.110)

Accordingly, Faustus told Augustine frankly that he did not know the answers to his questions about the cosmos; and Augustine makes it clear that this was a matter of policy with Faustus, "consistent in this approach to all the more difficult and subtle questions" as he puts it with noticeable chagrin (*Conf.* 5.7.12).

Despite Augustine's own polemical overlay, I would argue that we can detect a reminiscence of Faustus's response to Augustine in *Confessions* 5.5.8. There Augustine appears to speak in a manner completely at odds with both his own overpowering interests in the period he is

[20] Non enim, quem ad modum si quaesitum ex eo sit stellarum numerus par an impar sit, item si de officio multisque aliis de rebus in quibus versatus exercitatusque sit, nescire se dicat.

discussing and his persistent views on the harmony of the liberal arts and sciences with theology[21] that went so far as identifying astronomy as an integral part of philosophy just short of contemplative vision. He relates a systematic critique of considering astronomy or any other science as the proper purview of a religious authority, and of regarding as at all essential such matters that "are not necessary to the learning of goodness and piety." While Augustine would occasionally echo this distinction between the pragmatic cultivation of piety and the pursuit of knowledge in his subsequent works, it would never again be so pro grammatically stated as it is here in the context of recalling Faustus's dismissal of his own pursuit of scientific knowledge.

Faustus's lack of concern with a significant set of Manichaean teachings resulted in an approach to the religion that can only be called a kind of doctrinal liberalism. His attitude towards Augustine made it inconsequential whether the latter believed the details of Mani's teachings on cosmology, and indeed makes it unlikely that he held any committed belief in those teachings himself. Bear in mind that this liberal attitude found expression in the most private conferences between the Manichaean bishop and individual auditors such as Augustine. By prioritizing the proof of tested outcome, Faustus stood ready to affirm *any* doctrine that produced the desired effect in the character and conduct of the individual. His commitment to Manichaeism stemmed entirely from his observation that it worked. The more remote a particular doctrine was from direct engagement with the moral and ritual ethos of the faith, the less essential it was as a matter of commitment.[22] Ultimately, any number of alternative views could coexist within a single community united around its value system.

Augustine had expected Faustus to reveal or explain everything, to open up the concealed truths of Manichaeism. Instead, Faustus had taken with Augustine the stance of the Academic, demurring from asserting that things were either this or that on points that greatly concerned Augustine but Faustus regarded as *adiaphora*. He sought to impress upon Augustine the need to act on the plausible, to practice Manichaeism because its entire system held plausibility or likeness to truth due to its consistency with the basic dualistic premise arrived at by

---

[21] See Virgilio Pacioni, "Liberal Arts," *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, Allan Fitzgerald, ed. (Grand Rapids, 1999), 492–494.

[22] Cf. *Acad. pr.* 2.3.8: Academics "are bound by no compulsion to support all the dogmas laid down for us almost as edicts by certain masters."

inductive reasoning from experience, as well as by its ability to successfully motivate spiritually liberating conduct. Immediate engagement in practice was coordinated in Faustus's program with the gradual acquisition of understanding of Manichaean tenets, as the reformed and purified mind grew better able to discern truth from falsehood. In a sense, then, one practiced the religion *prior to* faith in it. A likely reminiscence of this program is to be found in Augustine's *Util. cred.* 1.2: "they said we were terrorized by superstition and that we were commanded to have faith before rational understanding, but that they urged no one to believe until the truth was fully discussed and proved." Here again, Cicero seems to provide the immediate background, responding to a similar demand to trust in authority as the Manichaeans challenged:

> For as to their assertion that the teacher whom they judge to have been a wise man commands their absolute trust, I would agree to this if to make that judgement could actually have lain within the power of unlearned novices (for to decide who is a wise man seems to be a task that specially requires a wise man to undertake it); but granting that it lay within their power, it was only possible for them after hearing all the facts and ascertaining the views of all the other schools as well, whereas they gave their verdict after a single hearing of the case, and enrolled themselves under the authority of a single master. (*Acad. pr.* 2.3.9)

Faustus no doubt discovered in Cicero a congruence with views the former already held in common with other Manichaeans, and in the process of mining him for resources came increasingly to adopt Cicero's position more fully, while always remaining true to Manichaeism as a system of religious practice.

Augustine's Flirtation with Faustus's Scepticism

This connection of Faustus and Cicero is quite intriguing. Augustine, of course, was deeply enamored of Cicero, and it was in embracing the latter's call to move beyond rhetoric to philosophy as a way of life (*Hortensius*) that Augustine came to Manichaeism. Cicero was a key point of shared background between Augustine and Faustus. We do not know if Cicero was among the readings the two undertook together in 382–383 CE, but it is a safe bet. It is just possible that the *Academica* itself formed part of this reading, but at least it is apparent that Faustus had this text in his background as the subtext of his own position. Augustine appears to draw on *Academica* 1.14.16 and 2.23.74 in praising Faustus's

modesty and awareness of his own limitations in language evocative of the familiar declaration of Socrates that his wisdom lay in knowing that he did not know (*Conf.* 5.7.12). What centuries of later readers have taken as a polite reference to Faustus's intellectual limitations turns out to be a fairly explicit declaration of his philosophical commitments.[23] They are commitments that Augustine continues to see as virtuous long after he has turned his back on Manichaeism itself.

But this did not happen at once. Despite his best efforts in the *Confessions* and elsewhere to suggest that Faustus's refusal to deal with his concerns marked a breaking point for him with Manichaeism, we know from a century of careful research that he continued to be a practicing Manichaean for as much as three more years. He studied with Faustus,[24] relocated to the Manichaean community in Rome, and himself declares that when leaving for Milan had no idea he was saying goodbye forever to the Manichaeans there. If anything, Augustine hints at a more active participation in the Manichaean community during his Rome sojourn. And yet he also claims that his first years in Italy were lived as a sceptic. Augustine expressly identifies his "sceptical" period with his time as a Manichaean in Rome (*Conf.* 5.10.19).[25] The contradiction is only apparent. Both allegiances were true. Augustine continued to be a *practicing* Manichaean, while at the same time emulating Faustus's scepticism. He considered himself free, as Faustus was, to reserve assent to all that Manichaeism taught. Such liberty of conscience while acting on commitment to a religious practice is precisely the attitude cultivated by Faustus in his own self-presentation. But once Augustine's reservations of belief had become not a perceived shortcoming but an affirmed way of life, Manichaeism no longer held any preferred position for him. From

---

[23] The emphasis of the praise of Socrates in the New Academy fell precisely on the active cultivation of virtue while maintaining sceptical reservations about doctrine: "Socrates…believed this to have been the reason why Apollo declared him to be the wisest of all men, because all wisdom consists solely in not thinking that you know what you do not know. He used to say this regularly, and remained firm in this opinion, yet nevertheless the whole of his discourses were spent in praising virtue and in exhorting mankind to the zealous pursuit of virtue" (*Acad. post.* 1.4.16).

[24] As stressed by James O'Donnell, *Confessions* (Oxford, 1992), vol. 2, 303.

[25] In *Beat. vit.* 1.4 he attempts to separate them as distinct periods: "When I left those men once I had investigated them, the Academicians above all held my rudder for a long time…" The best one can say about this representation of his actions is that Augustine is being true to his own values, since his *thinking* was already in the hands of scepticism even while his *practice* as a Manichaean continued without any deep significance for him.

the rhetorical scepticism of general Manichaean polemic, through the applied scepticism of Faustus's approach to the faith, Augustine found himself coming to the threshold of a universal scepticism that for him was paralyzing. This is what he tells us in the *Contra Academicos* itself,[26] in his *Epistle 1* written at the time,[27] and in other works written over the years referring to this period.[28]

Augustine reminds the Manichaean Honoratus of this pitfall of Manichaean use of scepticism, that they were better at refuting the opinions of others than in articulating and defending their own (*Util. cred.* 1.2).[29] Once trained in sceptical techniques of refutation, nothing prevented Augustine from turning them on Manichaeism itself.[30] The notion, however, that a turn to scepticism marked for Augustine a turn away from Manichaeism is ill-informed. Scepticism did not refute Manichaeism for Augustine; it simply relegated it to the same realm of doubt shared by all other systems of truth. He expressly reports in *Confessions* 5.14.25 that he could not refute Manichaeism, by sceptical

---

[26] He complains that, "up to now I have arrived at no certainty, but have been impeded in my search by the arguments and disputes of the Academics. Somehow or other they persuaded me of the probability . . . that man cannot find the truth" (*C. Acad.* 2.9.23).

[27] In this, Augustine's oldest surviving letter, he discusses the *Contra Academicos* with one Hermogenianus. He says that in working through the dialogue he had "broken a most hateful bond whereby I was held back from philosophy's breast by a despair for truth" (*Ep.* 1.3). In the context of a seemingly interminable modern debate, it should be noted that he speaks of *C. Acad.* in this letter as his own composition, not as a record of an actual discussion.

[28] In *Util. cred.* 8.20, scepticism is described as a lure and temptation considered alongside of other possible intellectual positions in his period of indecision; the same period is reviewed in the *Conf.* as one of doubt while he continued to participate in Manichaeism, though troubled by not being able to accept all that it taught. Similarly, in *Ench.* 7.20, written in the 420s, he talks of writing the *C. Acad.* "at the beginning of my conversion to prevent the contrary arguments of those who were voicing their objections at the very threshold, as it were, from being an obstacle to us. Unquestionably there was need to remove the despair of finding truth." In his *Retr.* 1.1, he says that he wrote the work before being baptized in order "by the most cogent reasoning I could muster to rid my mind of the arguments of the Academics. . . . These arguments were troubling me." Augustine affirms the basic sceptical critique of sensory-based apprehensions of reality in *C. Acad.*, while at the same time proposing to move beyond that level of reality through direct access to intelligible truth by postulating that such was the epistemological intention of Academic scepticism all along.

[29] Cf. Cicero, *Acad. post.* 1.4.16: "The method of discussion pursued by Socrates in almost all his dialogues . . . is to affirm nothing himself, but to refute others . . ."

[30] This is how John Mourant ("Augustine and the Academics," *Recherches Augustiniennes* 4 [1966]: 67–96) sees the connection of Augustine's composition of *C. Acad.* to his exit from Manichaeism: scepticism is a tool of Manichaeism that dead ends in self-refutation, to which a new alternative is required.

or any other lines of argument available to him prior to his conversion: "At this point I directed all my mind's efforts to whether I could by some decisive proofs somehow convict the Manichaeans of falsity.... Yet I wasn't able to."[31] Augustine's turn to scepticism, far from being an act of opposition to Manichaeism, arose out of his experience as a Manichaean, and was indicative of an effort on his part to follow the example of his mentor Faustus.

Faustus's liberal attitude towards points of Manichaean teaching only served to reinforce the doubts Augustine already had. Because Augustine was a very different sort of person than Faustus, he could not succeed in emulating either his mentor's liberal attitude towards doctrine or his prioritization of practice. Knowing truth was too important for Augustine, pious activity too insignificant for him. In undertaking a practical commitment while holding mental reservations about an intellectual commitment, Augustine attempted a mode of life to which he apparently was unsuited, and room was opened in his thinking to ideas that offered a certainty Manichaeism—at least as represented by Faustus—failed to provide. We can make sense, then, of Augustine's insistence that he was a Manichaean a mere nine years, and his exclusion from that period of everything that he did as a Manichaean after meeting Faustus, by understanding him as a man who valued theory over practice, belief over deed, truth over virtue. Augustine could only consider himself a Manichaean so long as its proposed truths held some conviction for him. The additional time he spent behaving outwardly as a Manichaean meant nothing to him without a corresponding belief held with utter confidence. He could not be persuaded by Faustus that action is everything, that a Manichaean or a follower of Christ is one in deed, not thought.

Thought, the Manichaeans contended, is unstable, invaded by doubt and temptation. The Manichaean cultivates virtues and dispositions rather than intellectual propositions. The latter provide rationales, but the Manichaean ethos is sustained by affect. For Faustus, the reasoned truth of dualism takes one as far as necessary to validate the way of life revealed by Christ as the needed response to evil. The very idea that one's own thoughts could not be trusted, that truth could not be gazed

[31] In *C. Acad.* Licentius is made to echo Augustine's own situation—as well as the proper attitude of an Academic—when he says of the Academic position: "I do not know if it is true; however, it is probable. Nor do I see anything else that I might follow" (*C. Acad.* 2.7.16).

upon in its naked beauty, terrified Augustine, and opened before him the gaping abyss of nihilism. From all that he tells us—deliberately and by accident—of himself, Augustine was the sort of person who required a rock solid foundation of reality and truth to even breathe.

While Augustine cannot be said to have ceased to be a Manichaean when he adopted scepticism, the latter did eventually provide his exit from membership in the Manichaean community. Scepticism mediates Augustine's transition from a *pro forma* Manichaeism to an equally *pro forma* Nicene Christianity that he adopted with no greater conviction than his abandoned Manichaeism had held for him.

> Considering it more and more and reflecting on it, however, I concluded that most philosophers understood much more *plausible* things about the material world and about every nature to which the senses of the flesh reach. Accordingly, doubting everything and wavering about everything in the fashion of the Academicians, as they are held to do, I resolved that the Manichaeans should be abandoned, thinking at that time of doubt that I shouldn't remain in this sect since I was already putting some philosophers above it. Yet I completely refused to commit the healing of my weak soul to these philosophers, since they were without Christ's saving name. I therefore decided for the time being to be a catechumen in the Catholic church I was entrusted to by my parents, until some certainty would shine forth by which I might direct my course" (*Conf.* 5.14.25, cf. *Util. cred.* 8.20).

When and how, then, did Augustine finally embrace a more certain commitment to Nicene Christianity that displaced scepticism from its dominant place in his thinking? We supposedly have a dramatic conversion scene in the Garden in Milan. This ostensibly culminates in a decision to embrace the Catholic Church in its institutional authority offering a system of belief and practice—a move that necessarily requires a break with a fully sceptical outlook. According to the standard rendering of the story, Augustine retires to Cassiciacum in the aftermath of this "conversion" to prepare himself for baptism. Closer examination shows this depiction to be in serious error. He reports no such intention prior to his Cassiciacum retreat, and enrolls his name for Easter baptism only after returning to Milan. He reports in the *Contra Academicos* that even at the beginning of his retirement "here in the country" at Cassiciacum he still found the Academic position rhetorically persuasive (*C. Acad.* 3.15.34). This statement should be compared with what he says in his *Epistle* 1, where he explains that he wrote the *Contra Academicos* to free himself from a way of thinking that had a hold of him up to that time. With clear remarks such as these, any "conversion" that

may have occurred in the Milanese garden cannot have been a full commitment to a new system, but at best an experience of *attraction* to a system, and most likely merely a decision to give full attention to considering options of commitment and assent. It is only in weighing and working through the validity of a dogmatic form of Platonism that appeared to be compatible with the obligations of faith in the Catholic Church that Augustine brought himself to the level of commitment we usually mean by the term "conversion."[32]

Faustus's Scepticism and Augustine's Contra Academicos

Scepticism and Manichaeism alike limit reality to the material and sensory, and both raise doubts about human capacity to distinguish the true from the false in this reality, pointing to the corruption and distortion of the senses. Augustine agreed with Faustus that scepticism raised proper doubts about knowing via the senses and the material world. But he found sceptical critiques harmless against the intelligible reality of the Platonists. The intelligible is not known through the senses or the material, but through revelation or recollection. Our certainty in the intelligible is innate, as in the case of mathematics, and does not depend on any experience (see *Conf.* 6.5.7). Augustine had come to believe through Cicero that the Academic sceptics were fully apprized of this character of their position, and that the only mistake came from trying to apply Academic scepticism without taking the intelligible into account as the alternative to the discredited realm of the senses. Academic scepticism does not apply to all knowledge, but only materially-derived knowledge. By opting for this construal of the sceptical tradition, Augustine freed himself to embrace the positive dogmas of Platonism.

So it was that, at the beginning of his intellectual sabbatical in the autumn of 386, Augustine set out to resolve his epistemological problems in the work now known as *Contra Academicos*, but conceived not so much as a refutation as a reconstrual of Academic scepticism. Returning to Faustus's own sources—in particular the *Academica* of Cicero—Augustine sought to challenge those aspects of the sceptical tradition that

[32] For a detailed examination of this process, see my *Augustine's Manichaean Venture: Conversion and Apostasy in the Late Fourth Century* (Philadelphia, 2009).

threatened to paralyze him in indecision and inaction. In doing so, he completely discredits the Academic affirmation of action, and charges that scepticism inevitably leads to moral paralysis. Picking up Faustus's own favorite proof from testing in action, he imagines a case involving two travelers, one of whom trusts no advice, and wanders without direction, and another who listens to advice, though without sufficient reason to trust it, and finds his way to his destination because of his trust. Even if philosophically we object that he had no good reason to heed the advice of a stranger, we cannot gainsay the good outcome that proved it right (*C. Acad.* 3.15.34). This argument simply takes up Faustus's pragmatic program; all that Augustine adds to that program is what he regards as a necessary reconstrual of the attitude required to actually test a particular perception or idea: one must commit oneself enough to actually try out a proposition, and in his opinion withholding assent as scepticism requires precludes such an act of "faith."

In *Contra Academicos*, as David Mosher has pointed out, Augustine attacks scepticism not on the validity of its epistemology, but on the consequences of that epistemology for practice (*C. Acad.* 3.15–16).[33] Augustine thinks there is something wrong—something of a non sequiter—in the sceptical claim to act without assent. While agreeing with the sceptical contention that the human capacity to know things is deeply compromised, Augustine notes that we are forced to act even while being unsure of what we think we know that guides that action. Academics contend that such action must proceed while withholding assent from the probable as fact or truth. Yet to be able to act at all, Augustine maintains, one necessarily gives a kind of tentative assent to the reality of that to which the action is responding. To claim otherwise amounts to a vain attempt to avoid responsibility for one's actions. Moral responsibility means being committed to the bases of one's decisions to act. Therefore one must assent to what lies behind actions in order to act, however provisional or incomplete one's knowledge or one's assurance of the truth of these bases of action.

This argument, interestingly enough, is taken directly from Cicero's opponent in *Academica* (*Acad. pr.* 2.12). In other words, Augustine has accepted the critique of Antiochus of Ascalon of the Academic idea of action without assent. Mosher sums up Augustine's application of this argument as follows:

---

[33] David Mosher, "The Argument of St. Augustine's *Contra Academicos*," *Augustinian Studies* 12 (1981): 89–113, at 103.

> If it is morally reprehensible to withhold assent to the probable in the interest of escaping blame for error and sin, then it is morally obligatory to give assent if one is to accept responsibility for one's actions. Hence wisdom can be achieved only if one has the moral courage first to believe what one is trying to understand. If the skeptics are not willing to take this step even in the case of the 'probabilities'… then they will never be in a position, morally or otherwise, to advance from there to the truths which bring genuine virtue and happiness.[34]

Augustine avoids rehearsing the Academic response to this argument offered by Cicero. His reading of his source is partial, in both senses of that word. In fact, his focus on moral responsibility has very little to do with Academic concerns as they were enunciated in his sources. Rather, he seems to be redirecting the critique along the lines of one of his most often repeated charges about the Manichaeans, namely, that their dualist ideology permitted them to be absolved of responsibility for immoral conduct, provided that the act occurred without the person's mental assent, i.e., against the person's will. In other words, he conflates Academic and Manichaean positions in his conception of the position he wishes to overcome. Augustine's use of the impulse to crime as an example of the plausibly true is contrived and problematic in the context of Academic scepticism, which asserts only an *ability* to act on the probable, not a *necessity* to do so. His language reveals that the Manichaeans stand behind the curtain, as it were, for which the Academics are a convenient front. Augustine objects that all sorts of crimes can be excused with the words, "I did not assent, and therefore I did not err. How could I not have done what seemed probable?"—just as he attributed his own moral failings while a Manichaean to excusing his sins as acts caused by evil to which he did not assent with his soul.

Using the example of a youth who commits adultery, Augustine remarks, "I am completely at a loss to know how that young man sinned, if" as the Academic position would have it, "one who does what seems probable to him does not sin. The only possible answer I find is that they may say that to err and to sin are two entirely different things, and that, by their principles, they had in mind that we should not err, while they considered sinning itself to be of no great consequence" (*C. Acad.* 3.16.35). While at one level serving as a kind

[34] Mosher, "The Argument," 101.

of ironic joke at the expense of people who count rashness of belief as the most serious moral fault, Augustine's remark appears to reflect a uniquely Manichaean scenario that differentiates what the mind or soul knows and wills from what the person actually does under the influence of evil. To consent with the mind to evil is the error for which Manichaeism demands repentance. The evil impulse itself and the accident, as it were, of acting on it, are of less moral consequence. Augustine has found a very clever way to equate the sceptical concern with assent to error with the distinctly Manichaean moral emphasis on the mind's assent to sin over the mere fact of sinful action.

For Augustine, practicing the sceptical disavowal of assent makes both moral responsibility impossible and religious commitment meaningless. One cannot be held accountable for following and practicing a faith to which one gives only provisional assent as plausible (*C. Acad.* 3.16.36). Such a qualified commitment cannot yield the personal transformation on which spiritual progress depends. In making his argument against the Academic sceptics, therefore, Augustine seeks to undercut the attitude of Faustus. Faustus, like the sceptics, acts on ideas as if they were true, even if he acknowledges that some parts of the Manichaean system are abstruse and impossible for him to verify scientifically. Augustine himself had lived by this sort of half-commitment to Manichaeism for nearly a decade before he met Faustus. Faustus merely provided him with a fresh perspective on this doubt that gave it philosophical respectability via the Academy. Now Augustine has arrived at the conclusion that to act on the basis of knowledge one regards as only probable, with mental reservation, is nothing more than a moral ploy, an attempt to escape responsibility for one's actions in following the probable.

In this way, Augustine links his own inability to make progress in Manichaeism so long as he had mental reservations about it with his own tendency to excuse his conduct by means of the Manichaean explanation that we are not directly connected to our wrongful conduct. These two problems of the Manichaean Augustine were compounded rather than resolved by Faustus's proposition that it is perfectly alright to practice Manichaeism without assenting to everything it teaches. Faustus seemed to affirm Augustine's problematic state as perfectly normal, while it agonized Augustine himself. It did not work for him, and in the *Contra Academicos* he undertakes to refute it. Augustine's anti-sceptical arguments, therefore, are aimed not against generic Manichaeism, but against the Manichaeism of Faustus and of Augustine himself. It is Faustus as an individual, rather than as a representative of a generic western

Manichaeism, that marks the sceptical turn Augustine feels he must confront. In doing so, he uses Faustus against Faustus, the pragmatist against the sceptic. At all costs, one must act; and if scepticism poses an obstacle to action, then it must be sacrificed in favor of faith.

Throughout his earliest writings, Augustine constantly quotes the line from the Latin of Isaiah, "One must believe in order to understand." Reason requires a starting-point given by authority. This theme runs strongly from *Contra Academicos* to *De magistro*. Frederick Van Fleteren has proposed that it derives not directly from some still undetermined source, but by an inversion of the Manichaean promotion of reason as the basis of religious conviction.

> The evidence gathered from the *Confessions* and the Cassiciacum dialogues indicates that the dialectic between authority and reason dates back as far as Augustine's Manichaean days. The teaching of the Cassiciacum dialogues is a reversal of his Manichaean experience: now Augustine asks for the acceptance of authority before an attempt at rational understanding. Thus, the terms seem to be Manichaean, but the notion a Christian one based upon Augustine's notion of conversion to Christianity as an acceptance of faith.[35]

Augustine actually affirms sceptical epistemology insofar as it applies to its own proper materialist domain. Only the intervention of divine authority breaks into this realm of obscurity from outside. Divine revelation breaks into and resolves the limits of knowledge. This *deus ex machina* resolves what human reason is incapable of solving for itself. Assuming even with such sceptics as Philo of Larissa and Cicero that there is such a thing as truth, despite the lack of reliable human means to ascertain it with certainty, Augustine sees an essential role for faith in an authority capable of giving us a truth-project, a plausible claim of truth to investigate and pursue.

Augustine concedes that reason is superior to authority, "higher" in his ascending hierarchy of reality (*Ord.* 2.9.26); but it must be ascended to from the fallen condition of humans, which requires moral training and a faith commitment that directs reason in its ascent (*Ord.* 2.8.25). He acknowledges at this time that a few may be able to ascend by means of reason alone, but seems to place himself among those for whom this has not proven possible. In one sense, then, Augustine had

---

[35] Frederick Van Fleteren, "Authority and Reason, Faith and Understanding in the Thought of St. Augustine," *AS* 4 (1973) 33–71, at 56.

come around to the moral lesson Faustus had tried to impart to him. At the time of his disappointment with the Manichaean leader and his failure in attempting to follow his program, Augustine could "make no progress" in Manichaeism because he saw progress in terms of unfolding certain truth rather than unfolding ability of practice that signals that one is on the right track.[36] In his earliest post-Manichaean writings he still grapples with the chicken-or-egg dilemma of practice vs. doctrine and when exactly one can expect to have made sufficient progress in virtue to be able to trust one's assessment of truth.

François Decret has argued that what Augustine misunderstood about Manichaeism was that the unfolding truth it offered was a *gnosis*, not a science.[37] If Decret is right, then Faustus and his Manichaean associates understood Academic scepticism in exactly the same sense as Augustine believed Carneades and his successors had—using scepticism only to reject all sensory-based knowledge and force the mind to resort to the inner truth of the intelligible. Had Augustine been too impatient with the Manichaeans to follow through to this revelation of their true program? Manichaean texts make clear that this *gnosis* is understood to unfold through practice, through cultivation of virtues that deepen one's character and make one more attuned to divine truth. In a sense, then Augustine's own theory of moral discipline as mentally purifying, which he works out in Cassiciacum, is a belated recognition of how Faustus's pragmatic program was supposed to work—a recognition made possible by separating this program from its sceptical frame. In Cassiciacum, Augustine concludes that practice purifies the mind from the body to enable a more perfect knowing. Those who are incapable of grasping truth unadorned must be led by "precepts and deeds"—a clear invocation of Faustus's prioritization of practice (*C. Acad.* 3.19.42).

Faustus's Pragmatic Doctrinal Liberalism and the Confessions

More than a decade after his reassessment of Academic scepticism in its relation to faith and practice in the *Contra Academicos*, Augustine found his way back to both Faustus and the Manichaean leader's criteria of truth in his *Confessions*. In book 5 of the latter work, he casts Faustus

[36] François Decret, *L'Afrique manichéenne (IV^e–V^e siècles). Étude historique et doctrinale* (Paris, 1978), 256–257.
[37] Decret, *L'Afrique*, 262ff.

in the role of unwitting tool of God, presenting Augustine with exactly the right challenge at exactly the right time to set him on his course towards conversion to Catholicism. He paints a remarkable portrait of Faustus as a man endowed with the key virtues celebrated in the *Confessions*: piety, modesty, approachability, and most of all the confessional attitude of admitting his own deficiencies. He is a man who has achieved a sanctity of life, without ambition to progress towards higher truths. By Augustine's standards of the time, Faustus should rate criticism as one of the less gifted people incapable of advancing to philosophy. Yet in the *Confessions* Augustine does not draw this conclusion. He rather faults Mani for pursuing and claiming knowledge of higher things beyond the limits of what is required for piety. In this comparison, Faustus emerges the better man; and indeed he is depicted as better than Augustine himself, not dissipating his gifts on idle cosmological inquiries. Augustine does his best to strip Faustus of his explicitly sceptical program, and to characterize his intellectual choices as outcomes of a humble self-awareness of ignorance, turning Faustus into a model of a confessional soul. The portrait is no doubt meant to be ironic and tragic, given Faustus's error, yet its signals of respect are unmistakable.

Augustine proceeds in the *Confessions* to present the story of his own conversion in terms significantly different than those found in his writings stemming from the time of the conversion itself. In the works dating to 386–387, Catholic moral discipline is embraced as the necessary means for purifying the mind of its engagement with the body, so that a proper perception of intelligible truth may follow. Augustine embraces this moral program as an act of faith that Catholic dogmas derive from a divine authority and therefore must be true, even if Augustine is not yet intellectually fit to understand how they are true. They provide the premises that will guide his use of reason in pursuit of truth once his mind has been properly disciplined away from the lures of the body and the senses. Augustine turns all of this on its head in the *Confessions*. There he portrays himself gradually accumulating truths that tell against Manichaeism on his road towards the Catholic faith. It is as a culmination of a reasoning process that produces those truths, rather than as a precondition of being able to reason towards any truth, that he adopts the Catholic moral system. What is behind this reversal of the story?

It would seem that Augustine reconstructs the story of his conversion in the *Confessions* in order to make a case that Catholicism fulfills

Faustus's criterion of tested moral outcome. Augustine characterizes himself as a morally incompetent man, incapable of freeing himself from the body and achieving the ascetic life promoted by Manichaeism. The Manichaean religion fails to motivate him to reach his ascetic aspirations; only by embracing the Catholic faith does he find the inner strength of commitment to forego wife and wealth and fame. Therefore, by Faustus's own measure of truth, Catholicism rather than Manichaeism proves itself. If the Catholic faith produces moral adherents, then its doctrines must be true.

In a move that Augustine no doubt intended to make his point clear, but which has served instead to cloud his intention from subsequent readers, he turns in the last books of the *Confessions* to an assessment of alternative cosmogonies, biblical and non-biblical. At one level, he simply defends the biblical account of creation against its Manichaean critics, as a kind of further confirmation of the truth of the Catholic faith. Yet he goes much further than this by surveying the many alternative interpretations *within the Christian community* of the biblical account. In the end, he admits that it is impossible to insist upon any one of these interpretations as certainly true and, in a truly remarkable set of passages, declares that ultimately which one is true does not matter.

> What does it matter to me that various interpretations of those words are preferred, so long as they [i.e., the words of scripture] are true? I repeat, what does it matter to me if what I think the author thought is different from what someone else thinks he thought?…Since, then, so rich a variety of highly plausible interpretations can be culled from those words, consider how foolish it is rashly to assert that Moses intended one particular meaning rather than any of the others. (*Conf.* 12.18.27, 12.25.35; cf. 12.4.4, 12.20.29)

One is put in mind of Cicero's presentation of the many reasonable but mutually incompatible cosmologies of his day in the *Academica*. Cicero sought in this way to demonstrate that the sage would do better than to put his faith in any dogmatic position, and should act instead in accordance with those plausible truths supported by the Academic criteria. Similarly, Augustine makes a powerful case at the end of the *Confessions* that truth—even biblical truth—is merely a tool for making morally reformed souls capable of ascent to God (*Conf.* 13.18.23). In other words, Augustine repackages Faustus's pragmatically-driven doctrinal liberalism as the ultimate thesis of his *Confessions*.

In all the many volumes Augustine produced over the subsequent thirty years, however, he never again put forward such a position of

doctrinal liberalism. This fact forces us to consider the possibility that he did not really mean what he said in the *Confessions*, or at least did not mean it to be his standard position on the expectations of Catholic faith. Instead, Augustine's unusual liberalism in the *Confessions* may have been part of a strategic appeal to the Manichaeans that seems to be a large part of his purpose in writing the work. It possesses a pervasive Manichaean sub-text, shaped by Augustine's peculiar and problematic position as a former Manichaean who had become the principal intellectual voice of the African Catholic church. His position of hindsight seems to have permitted him to penetrate and appreciate Faustus's pragmatic program as never before, and to have enabled him to turn it towards his own apologetic and proselytizing purpose. If my hypothesis proves correct,[38] then Augustine's most popular and appealing work owes much of its scheme to his deliberate emulation of the model Faustus had offered of the approaches and attitudes it takes to be an effectively religious human being.

Conclusion

Whatever one's assessment of the exact extent of Augustine's later debt to Faustus, the unique outlook of the Manichaean bishop has become, I think, that much clearer by delineating how his adopted scepticism, when applied to certain pre-existing tendencies in the Manichaean tradition, yielded a liberal attitude towards doctrine coordinated with a view of religion as constituted primarily of deeds organized within a system of practice. Seeing religion in these terms placed Faustus comfortably within the common understanding of the place of religion in the ancient world, and marks him among those resisting the shift towards stress on belief in dogmas especially characteristic of the Western intellectual tradition. The modern study of religion, arising largely from within a cultural context shaped by Augustine's own emphasis on doctrine, has tended until recently to see practice as handmaiden to belief. Even if Faustus in his withheld certainty over doctrinal questions represents a somewhat extreme case among his fellow Manichaeans, he points to a general tendency in the latter religion as a whole. His challenge to

[38] For the full argument of this hypothesis, see my *Augustine's Manichaean Dilemma: Making a Catholic Self in Late 4th Century North Africa* (forthcoming).

Augustine reminds us of the need to allow the variety of religions we study to de-center the form(s) of Christianity that have come to dominate the West from their controlling position in defining the very categories and perspectives by which we claim to understand both non-Christian religions, and even those ancient varieties of Christianity that defined themselves in other terms.[39]

[39] Johannes van Oort draws attention to indications that the Manichaean myth, on which modern scholarship has lavished such attention, was a subject of secondary interest to practicing Manichaeans, who were more focused on "the microcosmic significance of the macrocosmic drama" (Johannes van Oort, "Manichäismus," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Band V [Tübingen, 2002], 732–741).

THE CONVERSATION OF JOHN THE ORTHODOX WITH A MANICHAEAN: AN ANALYSIS OF ITS SOURCES AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR MANICHAEAN STUDIES

Byard Bennett
Grand Rapids

Of the various Greek anti-Manichaean works which are extant from the early Byzantine period, *The Conversation of John the Orthodox with a Manichaean* is not only the best preserved, but also demonstrates the most comprehensive understanding of Manichaean belief and practice. Since very little critical research has been done upon this text, I will limit my remarks in this paper to briefly examining what little is known about the authorship and dating of this work and then will suggest that the ultimate source of the author's knowledge of Manichaean belief and practice may have been a summary of the Manichaean cosmogony that was also used by Titus of Bostra and Theodoret of Cyrrhus but is no longer extant.[1]

The Known Manuscripts and Mai's Editio Princeps

The *Conversation* is extant in four manuscripts dating from the tenth to the thirteenth centuries:[2]

(a) **S** = *Sinaiticus gr.* 513 (383), membr., s. X, ff. 143^{v}–147
(b) **P** = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, *gr.* 1111, s. XI, ff. 220–225
(c) **B** = Athos, *Vatopedinus* 236 [olim 620], membr., s. XI–XIV, ff. 148^{v}–151^{v}
(d) **V** = *Vaticanus gr.* 1838, membr., s. XIII, ff. 267^{v}–272

---

[1] I have previously discussed the nature of this source document and its use by Greek Christian anti-Manichaean writers in my "Iuxta unum latus erat terra tenebrarum: The Division of Primordial Space in Anti-Manichaean Writers' Descriptions of the Manichaean Cosmogony" *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and Its World*, Paul Mirecki and Jason BeDuhn, eds. (Leiden, 2001), 68–78.

[2] A. Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, v. 4.2 (Rome, 1847), 104–110.

The first edition of the text was prepared in 1847 by Cardinal Angelo Mai, who based his edition on a single manuscript (**V**). Mai's edition is unsatisfactory in several respects. First, the manuscript he used is not only the latest of the four manuscripts but it is also exceedingly difficult to read. The manuscript is written in a rather untidy hand, makes extensive use of compendia (i.e. stylized abbreviations for words or the endings of words) and has suffered significant water damage (which makes the manuscript virtually impossible to read at some points). A further problem is the numerous errors made by Mai in transcribing and editing the text. The Latin translation prepared by Mai to accompany the Greek text offered little help to scholars; while woodenly literal in some places, in other places it is rather periphrastic and in some particularly difficult passages even seems to float somewhat free of the Greek text. These problems, plus the absence of a modern language translation, meant that there was very little discussion of the *Conversation* in scholarly literature of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The Question of Authorship

John of Damascus?

Mai's edition of the text was reprinted in 1860 by J.-P. Migne in the *Patrologia Graeca*.[3] Since Mai had assumed that "John the Orthodox" (mentioned in the title of the work in **V**, **S** and **P**) was to be identified with John of Damascus, Migne reprinted the text as an addendum to the works of John of Damascus, without offering any comment upon this attribution.[4]

Assuming Mai's attribution of the *Conversation* to John of Damascus to be correct, Martin Jugie argued that the *Conversation* should be regarded as the initial sketch from which John subsequently developed his longer work against the Manichaeans (the *Dialogus contra Manichaeos*; PG 94,

[3] J.-P. Migne, *Sancti Patris Nostri Joannis Damasceni… Opera Omnia*, v. 3 (Paris, 1860) = PG 96, 1320–1336.

[4] Cf. Mai, 104 n. 1: Intelligo Iohannem Damascenum. Attamen hic noster dialogus plane diversus est ab eo qui extat contra Manichaeos sub illius nomine in Opp. T. I. p. 429 seq. The question of whether the work should be ascribed to John of Damascus is left undecided by Joseph Langen (*Johannes von Damaskus. Eine patristische Monographie* [Gotha, 1879], 264), H. Beck (*Vorsehung und Vorherbestimmung in der theologischen Literatur der Byzantiner*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 114 [Rome, 1937], 16), and H.-G. Beck (*Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, 2 ed. [Munich, 1959], 478).

1505–1584).[5] This view was rejected by Konstantinos Dyobouniotes, who argued against the attribution of the *Conversation* to John of Damascus, noting certain differences between the views expressed in the *Conversation* and those found in the authentic works of John of Damascus.[6] The attribution of the *Conversation* to John of Damascus was similarly rejected by J. M. Hoeck.[7]

John the Grammarian of Caesarea?

More recently, Marcel Richard has argued that John the Orthodox should be identified not with John of Damascus, but rather with the early sixth century neo-Chalcedonian writer John the Grammarian of Caesarea. Richard therefore invited Michel Aubineau to prepare a new edition of the *Conversation* and included this within his edition of the works of John of Caesarea.[8] Richard's attribution of the *Conversation* to

---

[5] M. Jugie, "Jean Damascène (Saint), Écrits," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, A. Vacant, E. Mangenot, and E. Ammann, eds. (Paris, 1924), Vol. 8, col. 700: "Contre les manichéens, il nous reste de Jean deux dialogues. Le premier, très court, est sans doute une première ébauche du second, qui est beaucoup plus développé… [le premier] ne contient rien qui ne se retrouve dans le second…" For a convincing refutation of Jugie's theory, see Beck, *Vorsehung*, 17. Jugie's theory may be dependent upon the earlier judgment by Otto Bardenhewer (*Patrologie*, 3 ed. [Freiburg im Breisgau, 1910], 506) that both dialogues were authentic works of John of Damascus and had essentially the same content, though the Conversation was shorter ("Wesentlich gleichen Inhalts, aber viel kleiner an Umfang"). Bardenhewer's judgment was similarly reproduced in Dionys Stiefenhofer, *Des heiligen Johannes von Damaskus Genaue Darlegung des orthodoxen Glaubens* (Munich, 1923), LXIII.

[6] K. Dyobouniotes, Ἰωάννης ὁ Δαμασκηνός (Athens, 1903), 51–52. I. Rochow ("Zum Fortleben des Manichäismus im Byzantinischen Reich nach Justinian I," *Byzantinoslavica* 40 [1979]: 19) takes a somewhat similar position, but is willing to assign the Conversation to the first half of the eighth century in spite of the uncertainty of its attribution to John of Damascus.

[7] J. M. Hoeck, "Stand und Aufgaben der Damaskenos-Forschung," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 17 (1951): 23 n. 4: "Da er weder in der Vatikan. Handschrift, aus der A. Mai ihn zuerst herausgegeben hat (Vat. gr. 1838), noch in den beiden anderen mir bekannt gewordenen (Sinait. gr. 383 [Gardthausen] n. 10 und Paris. gr. 1111 f. 220^{r}–225) ausdrücklich dem Johannes Damaskenos zugeschrieben wird, sondern nur einem Johannes Orthodoxos, besteht eigentlich kein genügender Anlass ihn mit Mai dem Johannes Damaskenos zuzuweisen."

[8] Marcel Richard, *Iohannis Caesariensis Presbyteri et Grammatici Opera Quae Supersunt*, Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 1 (Turnhout, 1977). Aubineau was initially assisted by H.-C. Puech in preparing a critical edition of the text; see the latter's "La discussion de Jean l'Orthodoxe avec un manichéen: établissement du texte et commentaire en vue d'une édition," *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études. V^{e} Section-Sciences religieuses* 1964–1965, 104–105.

John of Caesarea, however, does not seem to have convinced Aubineau or many of the reviewers of Richard's work.[9]

Wolfgang Wassilios Klein has recently tried to develop further arguments in support of Richard's attribution of the *Conversation* to John of Caesarea.[10] Although Klein's arguments are sufficiently complex that I cannot discuss them here, I believe that his arguments are ultimately unsuccessful, since they depend upon assumptions that are undefended and may not be valid.[11]

Maximus the Confessor?

The fifteenth-century Byzantine theologian Gennadios Scholarios refers to a work purporting to report a conversation between an orthodox Christian and a Manichaean and appears to attribute the work in question to Maximus the Confessor. It might therefore be asked whether Maximus is the author of the anti-Manichaean work under consideration in this essay. Gennadios' reference to this work occurs in a chain of quotations from patristic authors, which Gennadios advances in support of his position on the procession of the Holy Spirit:

---

[9] Cf. Aubineau's remarks (in Richard, 116) regarding Richard's attribution of the work to John of Caesarea: "Le plaidoyer de M. Richard (pp. XLV–LIV), extrêmement habile puisque même les disparités entre les textes sont invoquées comme des signes de complémentarité dans l'oeuvre d'un même auteur, ce plaidoyer n'est pas dépourvu de vraisemblance. Nous préférons toutefois lui en laisser la responsabilité." Among the reviewers of Richard's book who advise caution or express skepticism concerning Richard's attribution of the Conversation and other anti-Manichaean works to John of Caesarea, see J. Darrouzès in *Revue des études byzantines* 36 (1978): 276; M. Simonetti in *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 14:3 (1978): 438; and A. de Halleux in *Muséon* 90:3–4 (1977): 461–462. In a longer and more systematic review, Halleux has raised some important questions about the historical foundations of Richard's reconstruction of the life and works of John of Caesarea; see Halleux, "Le 'synode néochalcédonien' d'Alexandrette (ca. 515) et l'Apologie pour Chalcédoine de Jean le Grammarien: À propos d'une édition récente," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 72 (1977): 593–600.

[10] Wolfgang Wassilios Klein, "Der Autor der Joannis Orthodoxi Disputatio cum Manichaeo," *Oriens Christianus* 74 (1990): 234–244; idem, *Die Argumentation in den griechisch-christlichen Antimanichaica* (Wiesbaden, 1991), 27–28.

[11] In particular, I doubt that the two anti-Manichaean homilies transmitted with the Conversation in cod. Vatopedinus 236 can be attributed to the author of the Conversation without further evidence and argument. I have also elsewhere cast doubt upon the historicity of the debate described in the Disputation of Paul the Persian with Photinus the Manichaean (PG 88, 529–552); see my "Paul the Persian" in the supplement to the *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (forthcoming).

> ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ Ὀρθοδόξου καὶ Μανιχαίου διαλέξει: "Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως ἐκπορεύεται τοῦ Πατρός."[12]
>
> The same [sc. Maximus the Confessor] in the conversation of an Orthodox and a Manichaean: "The Spirit proceeds from the hypostasis of the Father."

The quotation given here does not come from the anti-Manichaean work under consideration in this essay but rather from one of the ps.-Athanasian *Dialogues on the Holy Trinity*.[13] Gennadios or his source evidently misread the abbreviation used in the dialogue to identify the heretical opponent MAK. as MAN., "Manichaean," rather than MAK., "Macedonian."[14]

A Preliminary Conclusion Regarding the Date of the Text: The Ninth Century as a Terminus Ante Quem

Although the author of the *Conversation* cannot presently be identified with a known historical individual, the assumption in the secondary literature that the *Conversation* dates from the sixth to the eighth century is certainly reasonable. There is no evidence in the text to suggest that the *Conversation* was written after the rise to prominence of the Paulician movement in the ninth century or that it was written specifically to address the Paulicians, the Bogomils or any later dualist movement. Neither the leaders nor any of the beliefs and practices peculiar to the Paulician movement (such as the rejection of the Eucharist and image worship) are mentioned in the text; instead the author of the *Conversation* attributes to his opponents certain practices (such as the veneration of the sun) that were peculiar to the Manichaeans and not

---

[12] Gennadios Scholarios, Tractatus de processu Spiritus Sancti II, part 4 (M. Jugie, L. Petit, and X. A. Siderides, *Oeuvres complètes de Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios*, Vol. 2 [Paris, 1929], 445, line 1); III (Vol. 3 [1930], 490, line 25).

[13] Aubineau (in Richard, 113) identifies the source as PG 28, 1208D (De sancta trinitate dial. III), although the summary heading for ps.-Didymus' De trinitate II.6.17 (PG 39, 444B12–13), a work known to be dependent upon the ps.-Athanasian Dialogues, also provides a close verbal parallel.

[14] It should also be noted that Gennadios elsewhere attributes this theological opinion to Gregory of Nyssa rather than Maximus; see Responsio ad syllogismos Marci Ephesi de processu Spiritus Sancti, response 8a (Jugie, Petit, and Siderides, Vol. 3, 503, line 30), and compare response 8b (504, line 33).

found among the Paulicians and other later dualist movements.[15] In conclusion, although a more definite *terminus a quo* for the production of the *Conversation* cannot presently be established, it is reasonable to assume that the dialogue was written at some time prior to the ninth century.

The Source of the Author's Knowledge of Manichaeism

When the information given in the *Conversation* concerning the Manichaean cosmogony is analyzed and compared with other Greek Christian anti-Manichaean works, the closest verbal parallels are with Book I of Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos* (written between 363 and 377).[16] There are also some secondary parallels with the notice on Mani in Theodoret of Cyrrhus' *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* (written in 452 or 453).[17] In what follows I will examine five features of the Manichaean cosmogony which are discussed in the *Conversation*; in each case, I will then compare selected passages from Titus of Bostra and Theodoret which present similar information, showing that all three of these works are ultimately dependent upon a common source.[18]

The Description of the Two First Principles in Their Original State

Conversation 58:[19]

"But since you say that there are **two first principles, God and Matter,** and **God** is **good** but **Matter** is **evil**, and you dare to distinguish a place that is **separate** and peculiar to each nature…"

---

[15] See Beck (*Vorsehung*, 15–16), rejecting an earlier suggestion by Langen (149) that the dialogue form might be connected with the refutation of the Paulician movement.

[16] On the dating of Titus' Contra Manichaeos, see Nils Arne Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof in Defence of God: A Study of Titus of Bostra's Contra Manichaeos—The Work's Sources, Aims and Relation to Its Contemporary Theology* (Leiden, 2004), 126–127.

[17] Regarding the date of Theodoret's Haereticarum fabularum compendium, see Glenn Melvin Cope, "An Analysis of the Heresiological Method of Theodoret of Cyrus in the Haereticarum fabularum compendium," Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1990, 53.

[18] Titus' Contra Manichaeos will be cited according to the page and line numbers in P. A. de Lagarde, *Titi Bostreni quae ex opere contra Manichaeos edito in codice Hamburgensi servata sunt graece* (Berlin, 1859; repr. Osnabrück, 1967).

[19] Richard, 125, lines 245–247.

᾽Αλλ᾽ ἐπειδὴ δύο ἀρχὰς εἶναί φατε, θεὸν καὶ ὕλην, καὶ τὸν μὲν θεὸν ἀγαθόν, τὴν δὲ ὕλην πονηράν, καὶ ἑκάστῃ φύσει κεχωρισμένον καὶ ἰδιάζοντα τόπον ἀφορίζειν τολμᾶτε…

- Compare Titus of Bostra I.5–7:[20]
  "…**two** contrary **first principles** of existing things…Accordingly, that madman (i.e. Mani) himself, writing things hard to bear, in any case begins, 'There was **God and Matter**, Light and Darkness, **good** and **evil**, in all things utterly contrary, so that the one has nothing in common with the other, both being unoriginate and living.' Then either one will indeed divide these from one another or, since they are friendly with one another, it will be evident that they are indeed in no way contraries. But it is clear that he [the writer = Mani] too says that these are **apart** from one another."

  …δύο ἐναντίας ἀρχὰς τῶν ὄντων…Γράφων τοίνυν ἐκεῖνος αὐτὸς ὁ χαλεπώτατα μανεὶς ἄρχεται πανταχοῦ· ἦν θεὸς καὶ ὕλη, φῶς καὶ σκότος, ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακόν, ἐν τοῖς πᾶσιν ἄκρως ἐναντία ὡς κατὰ μηδὲν ἐπικοινωνεῖν θάτερον θατέρῳ, ἀγένητά τε καὶ ζῶντα ἄμφω. Οὐκοῦν ἢ χωρίσει γε ταῦτα ἀπ᾽ ἀλλήλων ἢ σὺν ἀλλήλοις ὄντα φίλα καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἐναντία φανήσεται. ᾽Αλλὰ δῆλον ὅτι χωρὶς ἀπ᾽ ἀλλήλων καὶ αὐτὸς ταῦτα εἶναί φησιν.

- ° Compare Theodoret 377B 2–5, 9–10:
  "He [sc. Mani] said there are two unoriginate and eternal [beings], **God and Matter** and called **God** Light and **Matter** Darkness, and Light is **good** but Darkness is **evil**…He said God stands aloof from Matter…"

  Οὗτος δύο ἀγεννήτους καὶ ἀϊδίους ἔφησεν εἶναι, θεὸν καὶ ὕλην, καὶ προσηγόρευσε τὸν μὲν θεὸν φῶς, τὴν δὲ ὕλην σκότος· καὶ τὸ μὲν φῶς ἀγαθὸν, τὸ δὲ σκότος κακόν… ᾽Αφεστηκέναι τῆς ὕλης ἔφησε τὸν θεόν…

[20] Lagarde, 4, lines 13, 14–21.

Commentary:

- Here
  - the two first principles are introduced;
  - they are defined as "God and Matter" and as being good and evil respectively;
  - their separation from one another is emphasized.
- Titus offers slightly better verbal parallels than Theodoret:
  - Titus uses the term "first principles" (ἀρχαί), whereas Theodoret does not.
  - The notion of separation is expressed in the *Conversation* by κεχωρισμένον and in Titus by χωρίς plus the genitive, whereas Theodoret uses ἀφεστηκέναι.
- *The material common to the three writers is said by Titus to come from a Manichaean work, from which he quotes.*

The Primordial Division of Space into Four Quarters, with Evil Inhabiting the Southern Realm

Conversation 9:[21]

"I know, having heard many times from the Manichaeans, that Matter and God are separated in their own places and that **the southern** part belongs to **Matter** but the northern and **eastern** and **western** parts are allotted to the good God."

Διῃρῆσθαι τὴν ὕλην καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἰδίοις τόποις οἶδα, πολλάκις ἀκηκοὼς παρὰ τῶν Μανιχαίων, καὶ ὡς τὸ μὲν νότιον τῇ ὕλῃ, τὸ δὲ βόρειον καὶ ἀνατολικὸν καὶ δυτικὸν προσνέμεται τῷ ἀγαθῷ θεῷ.

- Compare Titus of Bostra I. 11:[22]
  "Again, by assigning the southern part to evil, they describe it as if it were a dream of creation. For where was the South before there was a south? And one region of the creation would not be more dishonorable than another. For what is on the left hand for the one looking toward the **west** is again found to be on the right hand for the one looking toward the **east**."

[21] Richard, 118, lines 35–38.
[22] Lagarde, p. 6, lines 3–8.

Αὖθις τὸ μεσημβρινὸν μέρος τῇ κακίᾳ διδόντες ὡς ὄναρ τῆς δημιουργίας διαγράφουσι. Ποῦ γὰρ ἦν μεσημβρία πρὸ μεσημβρίας; Ἀτιμότερος δὲ τόπος ἄλλος ἄλλου τῆς δημιουργίας οὐκ ἂν γενοίτο. Τὸ γὰρ εὐώνυμον ὁρῶντι πρὸς δύσιν δεξιὸν αὖθις εὑρίσκεται πρὸς ἀνατολὰς ἰδόντι.

° Compare Theodoret 377B11–13:
"…and God occupied the northern and the eastern and the western parts, but **Matter** occupied **the southern** ones."

…καὶ σχεῖν τὸν μὲν θεὸν τά τε ἀρκτῷα μέρη καὶ τὰ ἑῷα καὶ τὰ ἑσπέρια, τὴν δὲ ὕλην τὰ νότια.

Commentary:

- Here
  - ° primordial space is divided into four quarters;
  - ° the southern portion belongs to Matter/Evil;
  - ° the other quarters are allotted to God/the Good.
- Since the terminology used to indicate the cardinal directions in Greek fluctuates, it is hard to say whether Titus or Theodoret offers the closest verbal parallels.
- It is remarkable, however, that all three anti-Manichaean writers are aware of this doctrine, which Augustine indicates was known only to a few of the Manichaean Elect.[23]
- It is interesting to note that Titus does not clearly attribute the northern, eastern and western quarters to the good God, so *Titus cannot be the sufficient source for what the writer of the Conversation knew about the Manichaean cosmogony.*
- *Again both the Conversation and Titus claim to have received their knowledge of this doctrine from a Manichaean source* (in Titus' case, apparently the Manichaean book from which he quotes throughout Book I).

[23] Augustine Contra epistulam fundamenti 25 (J. Zycha, *Sancti Aureli Augustini… Opera*, CSEL 25 [Vienna, 1891], 224, lines 23–27).

The Origin of Corruption within the Terrestrial Realm—This Corruption Seen as Evil and Linked to the Disorderly Motion of Matter

Conversation 28:[24]

Manichaean: "**Where then do evils come from?**"

MAN. Πόθεν οὖν τὰ κακά;

Conversation 20:[25]

Manichaean: "Where then do sicknesses and deaths and evils such as these come from?"

MAN. Πόθεν οὖν νόσοι καὶ θάνατοι καὶ τοιαῦτα κακά;

Conversation 2:[26]

Manichaean: "…since **Matter was moving in a disorderly manner**…"

MAN.…ἀτάκτως κινουμένης τῆς ὕλης…

- Compare Titus of Bostra I.16;[27] I.17;[28] I.18;[29] 1.20:[30]
  "Nevertheless, whenever those originating from the mad one (i.e., Mani) hear such words, they raise a question, '**Where then**,' they say, '**do evils come from?**' 'And where,' they say, 'does the disorder seen in things come from?'…For there once was a time, he says, when **Matter was disorderly**…For, he says, '**Matter** once **was disorderly**'…But they [sc. the warring beings native to the realm of Matter], he says, **were disorderly**…"

  Ὅταν μέντοι τοιούτων ἀκούωσι λόγων οἱ ἐκ τοῦ μανέντος ὁρμώμενοι, ἀποροῦντες Πόθεν οὖν (φασί) τὰ κακά; Πόθεν δὲ (λέγουσιν) ἡ ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐμφαινομένη ἀταξία;…Ἦν γάρ ποτε (φησίν) ὅτε ἡ ὕλη ἠτάκτει…Ἠτάκτει γάρ, φησίν, ἡ ὕλη ποτέ…Ὁ δὲ, ἠτάκτουν, φησί…

---

[24] Richard, 121, line 140.
[25] Richard, 120, line 103.
[26] Richard, 117, lines 9–10.
[27] Lagarde, 9, lines 1–4.
[28] Lagarde, 9, line 13.
[29] Lagarde, 10, line 31.
[30] Lagarde, 12, line 14.

- Compare also Titus of Bostra I. 29,[31] where the same argument seems to be in view.
  - No parallel in Theodoret

Commentary:

- Here
  - the Manichaean interlocutor(s) argue that corruption and physical evils arise from Matter's disorderly motion.
- The verbal parallels between the *Conversation* and Titus are close, but not to the point that direct dependence would necessarily be required.
- *There is no parallel passage in Theodoret, so Theodoret cannot be the sufficient source for what the writer of the Conversation knew about Manichaeism.*
- *Titus again treats this question as coming from a Manichaean source and as supported by a quotation from a Manichaean writer.*
- *The argument described appears to have an apologetic character*, showing the appeal of Manichaean thought to those who wish to further understand the nature and origin of the evils one observes in the world.

The Assault of the Darkness on the Realm of Light

Conversation 58:[32]

"…Matter, having beheld the light of God, came to love it and **rushed** toward the light."

…θεωρήσασα ἡ ὕλη τὸ φῶς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἔρωτα ἦλθε, καὶ ὥρμησε πρὸς τὸ φῶς.

- Compare Titus of Bostra I.21:[33]
  "'Therefore,' the book in their hands says in the same passage, 'when, being at discord with one another, they had come to the top and even unto the borders and seen the light, a sight most beautiful and comely, then, inspired by the motion in them,

[31] Lagarde, 19, lines 10–15.
[32] Richard, 125, lines 248–249.
[33] Lagarde, 12, lines 22–26, 37–38; 13, line 2.

they took counsel against the light'…And if they desired…the light…(since indeed the author who describes the doctrines of the mad one [i.e., Mani] says, 'desiring')…"

Ὅτε τοίνυν (αὐτῇ λέξει φησίν ἡ παρ' αὐτοῖς βίβλος) πρὸς ἀλλήλους στασιάζοντες ἐπεπόλασαν καὶ μέχρι τῶν μεθορίων, καὶ τὸ φῶς εἶδον, θέαμά τι κάλλιστον καὶ εὐπρεπέστατον, τότε ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν αὐτοῖς κινήσεως ἐνθουσιῶντες κατὰ τοῦ φωτὸς ἐβουλεύσαντο…εἰ δὲ ἐπεθύμησαν…τοῦ φωτός…(ὥς γε ὁ τὰ τοῦ μανέντος συγγράφων φησὶν "ἐπιθυμοῦντες")…

- Compare also Titus of Bostra I. 23:[34]
  "But the invention of [i.e. the myth invented by] the barbarian [sc. Mani] is full of destruction; for he says not only, 'Matter saw,' but also 'It [sc. Matter] resolved to set upon it [sc. the Light].'"

  Ἀλλὰ πλῆρες ὀλέθρου [τοῦ] βαρβάρου τὸ πλάσμα· φησὶ γὰρ οὐ μόνον Εἶδεν ἡ ὕλη, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἐπιβῆναι ἐβουλεύετο…

- Compare also Titus of Bostra 1. 17:[35]
  "And when, having ascended further, it [sc. Matter] saw both the land and the light of the Good, it [sc. Matter] endeavored to set upon what was not its own."

  Ὡς δὲ ἐπὶ πλέον ἀναχθεῖσα εἶδε τὴν γῆν τε καὶ τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, ἐπιβῆναι τοῖς μὴ ἰδίοις ἐπιχειρεῖ.

  - Compare Theodoret 377B15–C9:
    "Being engaged in war, with some pursuing and others being pursued, they came to the boundaries of the Light, then, having beheld the Light, they delighted in it and marveled and wished with all their force to advance against it, and seize it, and mix it with their own darkness. Accordingly, as the incoherent and nonsensical and foolish myth said, Matter with the demons and the phantoms and the fire and the water **rushed** against the Light which had appeared."

    Τοῦ δὲ πολέμου συστάντος, καὶ τῶν μὲν διωκόντων, τῶν δὲ διωκομένων, μέχρι τῶν ὅρων τοῦ φωτὸς αὐτοὺς ἀφικέσθαι, εἶτα τὸ φῶς θεασαμένους, ἡσθῆναί τε ἐπ' αὐτῷ, καὶ θαυμάσαι, καὶ

[34] Lagarde, 14, lines 24–26.
[35] Lagarde, 9, lines 16–17.

βουληθῆναι πασσυδεὶ κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ στρατεῦσαι, καὶ ἁρπάσαι, καὶ κερᾶσαι τῷ φωτὶ τὸ ἴδιον σκότος. Ὥρμησεν οὖν, ὡς ὁ ἀσύστατος, καὶ φλήναφος, καὶ ἀνόητος ἔφησε μῦθος, ἡ ὕλη μετὰ τῶν δαιμόνων, καὶ τῶν εἰδώλων, καὶ τοῦ πυρὸς, καὶ τοῦ ὕδατος, κατὰ τοῦ φανέντος φωτός.

Commentary:

- Here
  - seeing the light, Matter desires it and proceeds against it.
- Due to a fluctuation in terminology, it is hard to say whether Titus or Theodoret offers the closest verbal parallels.
- *The common material is that which is included in Titus' quotation from his Manichaean source*. The use of a common source might also explain why the word ὥρμησε appears in both the *Conversation* and Theodoret (who refers explicitly here to an account of the Manichaean myth).

The Light's Initial Defense and the Seizure of Light by Matter

Conversation 58:[36]

"Having seen Matter prepared for war, the good God, having cut off **a part** of his own substance, threw it to Matter and the latter, **seizing it,** begot all the bodies…"

Ἴδὼν ὁ ἀγαθὸς θεὸς πρὸς πόλεμον παρασκευαζομένην τῆς οἰκείας οὐσίας μέρος ἀποτεμὼν ἐνέβαλε ταύτῃ, ἡ δὲ λαβοῦσα ἐγέννησε πάντα τὰ σώματα…

Conversation 2:[37]

Manichaean: "…**having taken a certain portion of** his own **power, sent** it to Matter, wishing to entice it [sc. Matter] with a **bait**. But Matter, **having seized it, swallowed it**. And so from the **blending** of both, composite things have come into existence."

[36] Richard, 125, lines 249–252.
[37] Richard, 117, lines 10–12.

MAN.... λαβὼν μοῖραν τινα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεως τῇ ὕλῃ προσέπεμψε, δελεάσαι αὐτὴν βουλόμενος· ἡ δὲ λαβοῦσα κατέπιε. Καὶ οὕτως ἐκ τῆς κράσεως ἀμφοτέρων τὰ σύνθετα γέγονεν.

Conversation 3:[38]

"...God..., **having taken a part** of him, he threw it to Matter...it **loved** the good and **swallowed** up the Light from it."

...ὁ θεός...μέρος αὐτοῦ λαβὼν τῇ ὕλῃ προσέρριψεν...ἐρασθεῖσα τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ φῶς καταπιοῦσα.

Conversation 6:[39]

Manichaean: "...**the good** God **sent** forth **a certain** divine **power** to hold in check the disorder of Matter."

MAN....ὁ ἀγαθὸς θεὸς δύναμίν τινα θείαν προεβάλετο πρὸς τὸ ἐπισχεῖν τῆς ὕλης τὴν ἀταξίαν.

- Compare Titus of Bostra I. 17:[40]
  "**The good** sent **a certain power**, which he [sc. the writer] also calls his glory, to guard the boundaries, clearly, and to be the proper **bait** to teach moderation to Matter against its will. Which indeed also came to pass. For Matter, having beheld the power that was sent, longed for it as one in **love** and by a further impulse **having seized it, swallowed it** and was bound in precisely the same way as a wild animal. For they [sc. the Manicheans] also make use of this example, since it [sc. Matter] was lulled by the enchantment of the power that was sent. Consequently, he says, in this way there came to be a mixing and **blending** of the power of the good that was swallowed and of the Matter that swallowed it, and thus from both this universe was created..."

  Ὁ δὲ ἀγαθὸς δύναμιν ἀποστέλλει τινά, ᾗ καὶ ὄνομα τὸ [=τὴν?] δόξαν αὐτῷ ἐπιτίθησι, φυλάξουσαν μὲν δῆθεν τοὺς ὅρους, τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς δέλεαρ ἐσομένην εἰς ἀκούσιον τῇ ὕλῃ σωφρονισμόν· ὃ

[38] Richard, 117, lines 15–18.
[39] Richard, 118, lines 29–31.
[40] Lagarde, 9, lines 17–27.

δὴ καὶ γέγονεν. Θεασαμένη γὰρ ἡ ὕλη τὴν ἀποσταλεῖσαν δύναμιν, προσεκίσσησε μὲν ὡς ἐρασθεῖσα, ὁρμῇ δὲ πλείονι λαβοῦσα ταύτην κατέπιε καὶ ἐδέθη τρόπον τινὰ ὥσπερ θηρίον. Κέχρηνται γὰρ καὶ τῷδε τῷ ὑποδείγματι, ὡς δι' ἐπῳδῆς τῆς ἀποσταλείσης δυνάμεως ἐκοιμίσθη. Γέγονε τοίνυν μίξις καὶ κρᾶσις τοῦτον (φησί) τὸν τρόπον τῆς τε καταποθείσης δυνάμεως τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ τῆς καταπιούσης ὕλης, καὶ οὕτως ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἐδημιουργήθη τόδε τὸ πᾶν…

- Compare Theodoret 377C13–D2:
  "**Having taken a certain portion** of the Light, he **sent it to Matter**, just as **a bait** and a fishhook. And the latter, having pressed close and spread over it, **swallowed** what was sent and it was bound and became entangled, just as in a snare."

  Μοῖράν τινα τοῦ φωτὸς λαβὼν, οἷον τι δέλεαρ καὶ ἄγκιστρον τῇ ὕλῃ προσέπεμψε· προσκειμένη δὲ ἐκείνη, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸ στρωθεῖσα, κατέπιε τὸ πεμφθὲν, καὶ προσεδέθη, καὶ καθάπερ τινὶ περιεπάρη πάγῃ.

Commentary:

- Here
  - the Good sends a part/portion of himself (i.e. his own substance) to Matter,
  - using this as a bait to trap Matter and hold in check its disorder;
  - the Matter seized the Light and swallowed it;
  - from the subsequent blending of the two principles, composite things came into existence, forming this present world.
- *The verbal parallels are remarkable here and include unusual details* (the Light sent forth as bait [δέλεαρ] for Matter; Matter swallowed [κατέπιε] the Light).
- *There are verbal parallels in both Titus and Theodoret*; note that Theodoret, whose parallels are normally weaker, here agrees with the *Conversation* in using the verb προσέπεμψε which Titus does not.
- *Titus again asserts that this material is drawn from the Manichaean source document.*

Conclusion

In conclusion then, significant parallels exist between the account of the Manichaean cosmogony given in the *Conversation* and the accounts provided by Titus of Bostra and Theodoret. Insofar as Titus treats most of the relevant details as being found in the summary of Manichaean teaching from which he quotes, it is likely that this summary document was the ultimate source of the common information that Titus, Theodoret and the writer of the *Conversation* had regarding the Manichaean cosmogony. It is not possible at present, however, to know with certainty how this information was subsequently mediated to the author of the *Conversation*, since although parallels with the *Conversation* can be found in both Titus and Theodoret, neither could be regarded as the sufficient source for all that the writer of the *Conversation* knew about the Manichaean cosmogony. This leaves open the possibility that the writer of the *Conversation* may have had access to the same summary document from which Titus quotes, and this possibility should be further investigated in future research.

THE MANI LOGION: "THE PURIFICATION THAT WAS SPOKEN ABOUT IS THAT WHICH COMES THROUGH GNOSIS" (CMC 84, 9–12)

Luigi Cirillo
Napoli

In the context of the Baraies abstract of the beginning of Mani's religious innovation, Mani criticizes the doctrines (*toùs lógous*) and baptismal rites (*tà mystēria*) of the Elchasaite Baptists (*CMC* 79, 14–93, 23). The central theme of the baptismal movement was man's interior purification that could only come about through baptismal rites. In fact, the Baptists did not know of any other way of redemption apart from that which was realized through baptism.[1] The logion quoted by Baraies[2] has a theological value, which has to do with the doctrine of redemption (*apolytrōsis*), expressed in technical language through the word *katharotēs* (purification). This text brings out the fundamental difference in matters of soteriology between Elchasaite Baptists and the gnostic tradition. Its content is due basically to Mani himself even if the expression (that is, the wording of the logion) inevitably depends on the author of the extract, Baraies, and on possible alterations through the translation from Aramaic into Greek.[3]

According to Elchasaite Baptists, who were Jewish-Christian, the efficacy of baptismal rites depended upon the "precepts of the Savior"

---

[1] For a complete examination of the subject, see K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* I–II (Göttingen, 1960–1961); *idem*, *Antike Baptisten*, Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Band 121, Heft 4. Cf. also W. Brandt, *Die jüdischen Baptismen oder das religiöse Waschen und Baden im Judentum mit Einschluss des Judenchristentums*, Beihefte zur ZNTW, Bd.18 (Giessen, 1910); *Jüdische Reinheitslehre und ihre Beschreibung in den Evangelien*, Beihefte zur ZNTW, Bd.19 (Giessen, 1910); *Elchasai, ein Religionsstifter und sein Werk* (repr. Amsterdam, 1971); J. Thomas, *Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et en Syrie (150 avant J.C.–300 après J.C.)* (Gembloux, 1935).

[2] Baraies came from the same cultural environment in which Mani was brought up; see M. Tardieu, "'Sur la naissance de son corps.' Chronologie et géographie dans le Codex manichéen de Cologne," *Annuaire du Collège de France* 43 (1993–94): 787–90.

[3] With regard to the biography of Mani in which the abstract from Baraies is cited, cf. R. Merkelbach, "Wann wurde die Mani-Biographie abgefasst, und welche waren ihre Quellen?" *Studia Manichaica. II. Internationaler Kongress zum Manichäismus*, G. Wiessner and H.-J. Klimkeit, eds. (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz, 1992), 159–166.

of the New Testament tradition. Mani criticizes precisely this belief on the basis of the following principle: "this body" is by its nature impure, the innate impurity of the body renders baptismal rites completely useless, hence it is absolutely absurd to believe that they come from a precept of the Savior (who would not order the performing of worthless rites).

Mani's criticism starts from the worthlessness of purification (baptism) of food. Baptists, in fact, purified everything they ate.[4] It makes no sense to introduce purified food into an impure body; the worthlessness of food is evident from the fact that the digestion of purified and non-purified food produces the same shameful result. As for the baptism of the body, it is, in its own right, worthless, as can be deduced by the fact that it has to be done every day. Mani's Baptists were Hemerobaptists. If baptism were efficacious, it would have been enough to purify the body once and forever; but that does not happen, in fact—Mani said to the Baptists—every day you feel disgusted by your body and every day your purification is not efficacious (*CMC* 83, 1–13). Hence, the purification of the body is independent of the precepts of the Savior; and baptismal rites are not part of "Christian" tradition. Purification can only concern man's soul: a principle in common with the Neo-Platonist tradition.[5]

The position of the Baptists on body impurity

According to Mani, the congenital impurity of the body derives from the demonic origin of mankind, which forms the basis of the myth which Mani himself displayed in the work *Pragmateia*, demonstrated through the coupling of the two demons, Ashaqlun and Nebroel.[6] According to the Gnostic tradition, man was not God's creation (the supreme God), but a creation of the angels (beings inferior to God). Early testimonies are traced back to Simon the Magician's disciples,

---

[4] Cf. B. Dodge, *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm* (New York-London, 1970), vol. 2, 811: *The Mughtasila.*

[5] It is attested to at the end of the second century of our era; Iamblichus (250–330 CE) speaks of it in his treatise, *On the soul*. For the general context, see A. J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, III, *Les doctrines de l'âme* (Paris, 1953).

[6] Theodore bar Khōni has made a summary of this work using a Syrian model as his source, see F. Cumont, *Recherches sur le Manichéisme*, I: *La cosmologie manichéenne d'après Théodore bar Khôni* (Bruxelles, 1908), 42–44.

Menander and Saturninus, probably belonging to the first half of the 2nd century's Antiochene environment, according to Irenaeus's testimony, *Adversus haereses* I,24,1. Saturninus, like Menander, set forth one Father unknown to all, who made Angels, Archangels, Powers and Potentates. The world, again, and all things therein, were made by seven angels. Man, too, was the workmanship of angels. They made a man "in the image, after the likeness" (*kat'eikona kaì kath'homoiōsin*, cf. Gen 1.26) of a luminous image originating from the supreme God who had appeared and immediately returned to the sky. But the man made by the angels could not stand up, and bustled about like a worm. The power from above, moved to pity, since the man was made after his likeness, emitted a spark of life, which lifted man, made him articulated and made him live.[7] With respect to this theme, quotations in Gnostic literature are numerous.

Baptists, instead, believed impurity of the body to be explained by different arguments, of which, though, there is no direct testimony. They were probably doctrines similar to the ones in the Pseudo-Clementines, where, because of his birth from impurity (cf. *ek mysarós stagónos*, *Hom*. III,20,1), man is greatly inferior to the first man, Adam, directly created by God, possessing the spirit of Christ and being immortal. In other words, the impurity of the body comes from its conception. Now, it is from this idea of man's birth that Peter's baptismal catechesis, in *Hom*. XI,26, and parallel *Rec*. VI,9 cf. IX,7,5–6, derives; in it Peter states that, to gain salvation, man has to be freed from his first birth which is a result of carnal desire, and be born again for God through the living water (which has the aim of changing the first birth). Peter bases his doctrine on John 3.5 (spiritual rebirth comes from water and spirit). Immediately afterwards Peter exhorts, with a terminology typical of the Baptists, to seek refuge in water, because only water can extinguish the ardor of fire. Whoever doesn't go towards water carries the "spirit of rage" that impedes one from turning to the living water of salvation (*Hom*. XI,26,4). This exhortation surely contains a reference to the *logion* quoted in the sacred book of Elchasaites, see *Elenchos* IX,15,4–6, in the context of the strange baptismal rite against rabies injected by a rabid dog which has in itself the "spirit of destruction." "Spirit of

[7] Cf. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, Book I, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. I (Eerdmans reprint, 1975), 348f.; Irénée de Lyon, *Contre les Hérésies*, livre I, Sources Chrétiennes 264 (Paris: Du Cerf, 1979), 320–323.

rage" and "ardor of fire" are expressions which are synonymous with concupiscence. Whence, a link is clear between the central idea of Peter's pseudo-Clementine catechesis on baptism, and the Elchasaite environment. Pseudo-Clementine baptismal doctrine, quoted in the parallel texts of the *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, can be traced back to a common source, the *Basic Script*, written probably around the middle of the 3rd century CE in Syria. Peter's pseudo-Clementine baptismal catechesis is important because it presents the Jewish-Christian point of view on the problem of the origin of evil.

The source of this question of capital importance was the *Enoch Apocalypse*, according to which the source of evil lies in the sin of the Fallen Angels, the Watchers, which was a sin of *epithymia*, see *I Enoch* XV,4, a sin which contaminated nature and that caused the birth of monstrous beings, the Giants (cf. VII,2 and IX,9). The Greek version of *I Enoch* X,9 calls the Giants sons of *porneia.* According to the *Book of Watchers* (chap. VIII), the Angels taught secret things (art, science, astronomy) to man, therefore there was great infamy and a lot of fornication. Then God ordered the Fallen Angels to be tied to the abysses of the earth; after that the Giants disappeared too (cf. chap. XIV,6), but their souls remained in the world as the spirits of evil (cf. chap. XV, 8–9 and XVI,1). Enoch's doctrines had a considerable diffusion. The books attributed to Enoch are five in number; they form the *Enochian Pentateuch* of Ethiopic tradition.[8] These books probably circulated separately in ancient times. The first book, *of the Watchers*, and the second book, *of the Giants* (which later was replaced by the *Book of Parables*) are the two books which interest our discussion. The *Book of the Watchers* and the *Book of Giants* are dated back to very ancient times.[9]

The *Book of the Watchers* and the *Book of the Giants* were read and copied in the Qumran community, as J. T. Milik demonstrated.[10] The

---

[8] See M. A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, I–II (Oxford, 1978).

[9] Cf. the academic discussion: according to P. Sacchi, "Libro di Enoc," *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento* (Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese [UTET], 1981), 440f., and *idem*, *L'Apocalittica giudaica e la sua storia* (Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1990), 67, the *Book of Enoch* may date to the fifth century BCE, and the *Book of Giants* is dated as approximately from between the 4th and the 3rd century BCE. According to John C. Reeves, *Heralds of That Good Realm* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 39, the *Book of Watchers* (*I Enoch* 6–36), may date to the 3rd or even 4th century BCE.

[10] See J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford, 1976), 298ff., 304, and 141; *idem*, "Turfan et Qumran. Livre des géants juif et manichéen," *Tradition und Glaube. Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe fur K. G. Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag*, G. Jeremias, H. W. Kuhn, H. Stegemann, eds. (Göttingen, 1971), 117–27.

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs developed the moral doctrine of Enoch, based on *epithymia* and *porneia.* For example, *Reuben* V,6, stresses that the Watchers sinned because of their *epithymia* (*en epithymia autōn*).[11] In rabbinical tradition, the evil instinct (*yezer hā-ra*) was identified with *epithymia* which, in the gnostic tradition, was called *antimimon pneuma*.[12] In the Christian tradition, Enoch's book was considered holy scripture, at least until the time of Tertullian,[13] who speaks frequently about the sin of the Fallen Angels. Mani knew Enochian literature; in fact, it was from the Jewish book of Giants that Mani took the material for his own "Book of Giants."[14]

Peter's pseudo-Clementine catechesis on baptism, based on John 3.3–8 (which for its basic theme is connected with the Enoch tradition) may explain the position of Mani's Baptists when they stated that their "purification" came from "the Savior's precepts." Mani, though, who since his formation among the Baptists was probably deeply influenced by Gnostic thinking, concluded the absolute impossibility of purifying the body, because of its origin from an impure creation, and hence the uselessness of baptismal rites. Hence, the reciprocal accusations: by the Baptists towards Mani that he did not respect their traditional rules and wanted to go to the "*Hellēnes*" (*pagans*, see *CMC* 80, 16); and by Mani towards the Baptists because from his point of view they practiced a non-authentic purification.

The position of Mani on body impurity

Against the Baptists' tradition, which was considered not to be derived from the Savior's precepts, Mani said which purification is authentic and what it involves: essentially, purification is outlined in

---

[11] R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (repr. Hildesheim, 1966), 11f.

[12] Reference can be made to A. Böhlig, "Zum Antimimon Pneuma in den koptisch-gnostischen Texten," *Mysterion und Wahrheit. Gesammelte Beiträge zur spätantiken Religionsgeschichte* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 162–173.

[13] Cf. *Apologeticum*, 22,3; *De virginibus velandis*, 7,3; *De cultu feminarum*, I,2,1; I,3,1–3; II,10,3; *De idololatria*, 4,2–3, etc.

[14] See W. B. Henning, "The Book of the Giants," *Selected Papers*, I, Acta Iranica 14, M. Boyce and I. Gershevitch, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 341–49. On the subject, cf. J. C. Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: the Influence of the Enochic Library," *Tracing the Threads. Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, J. C. Reeves, ed. (Atlanta: SBL, 1994), 173–203.

the Scriptures,[15] and it is that which comes from *gnosis*. Basically, *gnosis* is the knowledge of oneself, which necessarily implies the consciousness of the existential condition, which is due to the mixture of two opposite primordial Natures (Substances/Roots) and its consequences—a knowledge that leads one to carry out what is necessary to accomplish in one's own life, namely, the separation of Light from Darkness, of Death from Life, of Living Waters from Turbid, and to realize that each one (specified in opposite pairs) is different from the other. That is to say, the separation is to go back to the primordial Time, to the time before our time, when the mixture began.

Professor Koenen dedicated an excellent study to this text (*CMC* 84, 9–85, 4) to which reference has been made, concerning the integration of the damaged parts.[16] With regards the separation of the two Natures, see Augustine, *Contra Fortunatum* 14,[17] and Mani, *Epistula Fundamenti* 12,15.[18] Mani concluded by saying that "separation" has to go together with the observation of the Savior's precepts, so that He can redeem our souls from death and perdition. Now, this dispute between Mani and the Baptists on true purification was not isolated, and it discloses to us an important historical milieu concerning the Gnostic and Manichaean opposition to the Jewish-Christian Baptist movement in

---

[15] Because the question was purification according to the Savior's precepts, the expression *perì hēs elechthē* refers to the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament tradition. For the meaning of the expression see W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, 4th ed. (Chicago, 1958), s. v. *legō*, I.7, 468f.

[16] See L. Koenen, "From Baptism to the Gnosis of Manichaeism," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism. Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale, New Haven, Connecticut, March 28–31, 1978*, B. Layton, ed. (Leiden, 1981), Vol. II, 734–756. See also L. Koenen and C. Römer, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex. Über das Werden seines Leibes. Kritische Edition*, ARWAW Papyrologica Coloniensia 14 (Opladen, 1988), 58.

[17] Caeterum rebus ipsis paret, quia nihil simile tenebrae et lux, nihil simile veritas et mendacium, nihil simile mors et vita, nihil simile anima et corpus et caetera istis similia, quae et nominibus et speciebus distant ab invicem … Hinc vero constat et ratione rerum, quod duae sunt substantiae in hoc mundo, quae speciebus et nominibus distant (F. Decret and J. van Oort, *Sancti Augustini, Acta contra Fortunatum Manichaeum*, CFM, Series Latina (Turnhout: Brepoils 2004, 22).

[18] Unde si tibi videtur, inquit, ausculta prius quae fuerint ante constitutionem mundi, et quo pacto praelium sit agitatum, ut possis luminis seiungere naturam ac tenebrarum (*Opere di Sant'Agostino, Polemica con i Manichei*, XIII/2 [Roma: CittàNuova Editrice, 1997], 324). Cf. also A. Henrichs and L. Koenen, "Ein griechischer Mani-Codex," *ZPE* 5.1 (1970): 137 n. 101.

the 2nd and 3rd centuries. This statement comes from the new interpretation of the Oxyrhynchus Fragment 840 in the context of ancient Christian controversies over the validity of baptismal water.[19]

Authentic purification is an interior, spiritual purification, attested to in the Scriptures

Given this principle as clear, it is difficult to tell to which Scriptures Mani referred; but because of the Baptist context they have to be the Scriptures of the New Testament tradition, according to the interpretation of A. Henrichs and L. Koenen, in their comment to the Mani-Codex.[20] It remains an open question whether Mani's New Testament canon included any apocryphal gospel. The first group of texts concerns the difference between baptism as administrated by John the Baptist and the baptism given by Jesus (Mk 1.8 and parallel texts, Mt 3.11f., Lk 3.16; cf. Jn 1.33): John Baptist (who can be considered the model of baptismal practices in the Jewish tradition) baptized with water, while Jesus baptized in the Holy Spirit. Consequently it could be deduced that the baptism given by Jesus was independent from the rite of water.[21] Another context is that in which Jesus condemned the practices of the Pharisees, who were concerned with external rather than internal purification (Mt 23.25f. and Lk 11.38f.). Logion 89 of the *Gospel of Thomas* refers to this meaning of Jesus' words: "Why do you wash the outside of the cup? Do you not realize that he who made the inside is the same one who made the outside?"[22]

In this context, concerning the interior purification, Marcion's version of the text of Luke 11.2 has to be mentioned.[23] When the disciples ask, "Lord, teach us to pray as John did with his disciples," Jesus adds to the requests: "That your Spirit might come to us and purify us."[24] John 1.33 returns to Mark's tradition: John was sent to baptize in water;

---

[19] See F. Bovon, "Fragment Oxyrhynchus 840, Fragment of a lost Gospel, Witness of an Early Christian Controversy over Purity," *JBL* 119 (2000): 705–728.

[20] In *ZPE* 32 (1978): 143f., nn. 205–206.

[21] In the parallel texts of Matthew and Luke, it is said that Jesus will baptize with holy Spirit and fire.

[22] James M. Robinson, ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (San Francisco, 1996), 186.

[23] The Gospel of Luke was the only gospel accepted by Marcion in his Canon.

[24] See Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig, 1921), 188* f.

Jesus, on the contrary, baptizes in the Holy Spirit. According to John 4.2, Jesus himself didn't baptize; his disciples did.

To confirm the interpretation of purification made directly by the Holy Spirit, the experience of Peter in Caesarea can be quoted, too, according to Acts 10.44: the Holy Spirit descended onto the pagans before they received the baptism of water. Peter, in fact, understood that the pagans had been purified by the Holy Spirit, and nothing was left for him to do but ratify the work of the Spirit. One could also quote Acts 11.9: Peter's self-defense against the Jewish-Christians of Jerusalem ("you can not call unclean what God purified"), 11.15 ("Spirit came to the pagans as He had come on us"), 11.16 (the opposition between the baptism of John *hýdati* and Christian baptism *en pneumati hagiō*).

Some *logia* from the *Gospel of Thomas*[25] have to be added to the canonical tradition. According to *logion* 3, Jesus criticized any material conception of God's Kingdom and after saying that "the kingdom is inside you, and it is outside of you" (see the Greek text of the *Oxyrhynchus papyrus* 654), added, by way of conclusion or explanation: "When you come to know yourselves, then you become known, and you will realize that it is you who are the sons of the living father. But if you will not know yourselves, you dwell in poverty and it is you who are that poverty."[26] According to *logion* 89, which refers to the criticism of Jewish rites of purification in the synoptic gospels (see above), Jesus said that it is as necessary to wash the inside of the cup as to wash the outside, because he who made the inside, also made the outside.[27] The Kingdom of God is achieved only if the distinction between inside and outside is overcome.

The *Gospel of Philip* (NHC II,3) is a translation of a Greek text that was probably written in the second half of the third century CE. The statements on page 69 of the manuscript describe the mysteries of the bridal chamber. The highest moment of the Gnostic initiation was the sacrament of the bridal chamber, attested for the Valentinian school of Marcosians (see Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* I,21,3): Baptism is "the holy building," Redemption (*apolytrōsis*) is the "holy of the holy" (in the Jerusalem temple). "The holy of the holies" is the bridal chamber.[28]

---

[25] The original text in Greek, dating probably from the middle of the 2nd century, according to the most common thesis (see the fragments of this gospel in Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1, 654 and 655), was used in Egypt and translated into Coptic (NHC II,2).

[26] Robinson, *The Nag Hammadi Library*, 126.

[27] Cf. H.-Ch. Puech, *Sulle tracce della Gnosi* (Milano, 1985), 565ff., 396.

[28] Robinson, *The Nag Hammadi Library*, 151.

In the *Gospel of Truth* (NHC I,3), a work of the Valentinian school,[29] in sections 24–25, it is stated that only through Gnosis can man be purified of the multiplicity of the worldly things and achieve unity:

> When the Father is known, from that moment on the deficiency will no longer exist. As in the case of the ignorance of a person, when he comes to have knowledge, his ignorance vanishes of itself, as the darkness vanishes when light appears, so also the deficiency vanishes in the perfection. . . . It is within Unity that each one will attain himself, *within knowledge he will purify himself from multiplicity into Unity*, consuming matter within himself like fire, and darkness by light, death by life.

Hence, through Gnosis every man may achieve interior purification.[30]

The consequent rejection of any kind of baptismal rite

A text that comes close to the thoughts of Mani can be found in the final section of the *Apocalypse of Adam* (NHC V, 5), 84,4–85,31. The editing of the text can probably be said to have occurred during the 2nd century CE. In some respects, the writing contains a polemical attack on baptism,[31] which can probably be placed within the context of the history of the Jewish Baptist groups. The text does not contain any evidence of having been influenced by the Christian tradition. It is a Sethian writing which does not have any affinity with the Sethian Book V of the *Elenchos* (about which we will speak later), or with heresy 39 of the *Panarion*, against the Sethians. Adam speaks of the loss of the saving knowledge, both on his part and that of Eve, of the transmission of this knowledge to Seth and his descendants, as well as the preservation of this knowledge until the third coming of the Savior, the "Illuminator" (*Phōstēr*). The editor of the final section argues strongly against the doctrine of purification through baptism in water and concludes (cf. 85,22ff.) that the only baptism is the "hidden knowledge" that Adam passed on to Seth and to his elected race.[32]

---

[29] It is not to be excluded that the work attested in the NHC corresponds to the work quoted by Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III,11,9, whose composition would date back to around the middle of the 2nd century.

[30] See H. Jonas, in *Gnomon* 32 (1960): 327–335, and A. Henrichs, "Mani and the Babylonian Baptists: A Historical Confrontation," in *HSCP* 1973, 57, n. 130. See also J. Ménard, "La 'Connaissance' dans l'Evangile de Vérité," *Revue de Sciences Religieuses* 41 (1967): 1–28.

[31] A. Böhlig and P. Labib, *Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi* (Halle-Wittenberg, 1963), 93–95.

[32] *Gnosis* is passed down among those who are born through the everlasting "words"

The *Testimony of Truth* (NHC IX,3) criticizes the baptismal practices of the Church, which rests on the invalid belief in the efficacy of baptism in water, expressed by the term *sphragis* (69, 7–25). The "seal" cannot be gained through a rite that only deals with man's exterior such as baptism through water, but only through *gnosis* which expresses a complete renouncing of the world in its material form. "The baptism of truth is something else; it is by renunciation of (the) world that it is found." The renouncing expressed through the process of baptism through water is a false guarantee of salvation because it is expressed in words only. In addition to this, baptism through water does not correspond to the will of the Savior who did not baptize any of his disciples. The condemnation of baptism as practiced by the Church is also based on the negative significance of water from the earth, water full of negative value, in so much as it is the symbol of carnal lust (31, 1–3). This can be seen as a radical rejection of baptism through water. The type of baptism seen in the *Testimony of Truth* is that of renouncing the world in its totality (= *apotakē tou kosmou*).

In the *Paraphrase of Shem* (NHC VII,1) the rejection of baptism through water is motivated by the fact that the water of the world is a power of darkness, an evil power. "For the water is an insignificant body. And men are not released, since they are bound in the water, just as from the beginning the light of the Spirit was bound." It is completely false to think that sins can be redeemed through baptism in impure water.[33] Probably this polemic was directed against a Jewish baptismal sect, and quite likely it was directed towards the Elchasaites and their ancestors.[34]

The meaning of "living water" and "water springing up for eternal life" (Jn 4.10, 14)

The living water as God's gift is the revelation which Jesus brings, the true water which man needs. Living water symbolizes the superior world (heavenly water) and is opposed to earthly water, the water of the inferior world. This way of speaking about living water comes from the

---

of the Enlighteners who come from the sacred seed, the mysterious personage of "Yesseus, Mazareus, (Yesse)dekeus, the living water."

[33] Robinson, *The Nag Hammadi Library*, 37, 14–25.

[34] See references cited by K. Koschorke, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum*, Nag Hammadi Studies 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 146.

sphere of Gnostic dualism (cf. *supra*, Mani logion: Living Water/Turbid Water). The high significance of "living water" is evident from the *logion agraphon* 119 from the collection of Resch, in which the expression becomes a Christological title: Jesus says "I am the living water."[35]

The figurative use of "living water" referring to the revelation or the revealed knowledge of the divine mysteries is principally found in the *Odes of Solomon* of the Syriac milieu, VI,11–13; XI,4–7; and XXX. The passage from Ode VI is attested to in *Pistis Sophia* 65.[36] The importance of the Odes' contents lies in the fact that they are connected to that particular context of sapiential Judaism,[37] in which living water symbolizes revealed knowledge. Two texts of Qumran, Hymn VIII and 1QS III,13–IV,26,[38] can be considered to be particular expressions of this environment. As concerns Hymn VIII, living water is the font of esoteric knowledge of the divine mysteries, which gives life to the members of the community. In the Rule of the community, on the other hand, in the text which refers to the action of the "Two Spirits" (1QS III,13–IV,26), the author establishes a fundamental difference between the daily holy bathing of the community, and the purification of impiety, which will come at the end of time, and will take place through the "Holy Spirit" which God will pour on man like holy water. Only then, the author concludes, "will the righteous understand the knowledge of the Most High, and the wisdom of the children of heaven will teach them perfect behavior" (see 1QS IV,20–22).

Thereafter, living water becomes the focal point of Gnostic exegesis of the Gospel of John, as can be seen in the commentary of Heracleon, quoted by Origen in his own *Commentary on the Gospel of John*.[39] According to Heracleon, the living water in John, chapter 4, is the gift from God to the Samaritan woman which allowed her to gain the knowledge of God and her own consubstantiality with Him. The gift of living water was therefore an initiation into Gnosis. The woman knew her

---

[35] A. Resch, *Agrapha* (repr. Darmstadt, 1974), 164. In the final section of the *Apocalypse of Adam*, "Living Water" is the name of one of the illuminators who came from the holy seed of Seth and passed down the "hidden knowledge" of Adam.

[36] For the *Odes of Solomon*, see M. J. Pierre, in *Ecrits apocryphes chrétiens*, Gallimard, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris, 1997) Vol. I, 673ff.

[37] See *Proverbs of Solomon, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach.*

[38] For the two texts, cf. *La Bible. Ecrits intertestamentaires*, Gallimard, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris, 1987), 16ff. and 264ff.

[39] See *Origène, Commentaire sur Saint Jean*, tome III (Livre XIII), Sources Chrétiennes 222, XIII,63; 67; 92; 120. Cf. also, E. Corsini, *Origene, Commento al Vangelo di Giovanni* (Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese [UTET], 1968), 74–83.

state, which was the consequence and expression of the fall of man into the world of matter, represented by the rapport she had had with her many husbands. As a consequence of the fall the woman had lost the knowledge of her origin and nature, and was in a condition of ignorance of the superior good. The gift of living water allowed the Samaritan to know in a way which was consistent with her nature. At this point, Jesus invited the Samaritan woman to call her husband, who, according to Heracleon, means the celestial Twin, her alter-ego, her divine counterpart in the syzygy. The rejoining with the Twin is the salvation of man.[40]

The living water springs up for eternal life in three Gnostic Baptist sects quoted in the *Elenchos*, book V: V,6–11 (the Naassenes), 19–22 (the Sethians), and 23–27 (the followers of Justin, the author of the *Book of Baruch*).[41] The living water is the "heavenly" water, the archetypal water of the creation (cf. Gen 1.6), which has the power to give immortality, rebirth. Those sects practiced a particular baptismal rite which derived from Jewish purification rites of a sectarian origin.

The Naassenes took their name from the Hebrew word *naas* (snake), they called themselves 'Gnostics' and constituted a large number of sects which adopted the same form of heresy (*Elenchos* V,6,3–4; Wendland, 78). The snake from which they took their name was water, the first principle, according to Thales, without which no living being can exist. Water, though, had a spiritual significance, on the basis of which it came to mean a principle of divine nature, a strength immanent to the world, which "walks" (*odeuonta*) through all things. This water, stated the Naassene text quoted above, was the water that is above the firmament, the water which the Savior talks about in John 4.10; it is from this water that all beings draw their "substance" (or nature).[42] But it is we, the 'Gnostics'—continues the same source (V,9,21–22; Wendland, 102,11ff.)—who from the living waters of the Euphrates, which flows

[40] See also the vision of the celestial Twin in the Mani Codex 22,1–25,1.

[41] The expressions of Jn 4.10 and 14 ("living water," "water springing up for the eternal life") are quoted in *Elenchos* V,9,18 (Wendland, 101, 23–24); V,19,21 (Wendland, 120, 24–25); V,27,2 (Wendland, 133, 7); see R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John, A Commentary* (Philadelphia, 1971), 184 (and the accompanying notes).

[42] Wendland, 101f., i.e., that of primordial man, *Adamas*, who doesn't have a known form but who gives all beings their specific form (see V,7,18–19; Wendland, 82f.). See also the doctrines of the Elchasaite Sampsaeans in Epiphanius, *Panarion, haer.* LIII,1,7: the water was venerated, and considered as if it was a Divinity; it was said that through these waters came life.

in the middle of Babylon, take what really is ours (*tò oikeion*), going through that true door which is Jesus (cf. Jn. 10,9). That rite gave to the Gnostics what belonged to them, namely the divine nature. It seems that the baptismal rite was followed by unction with the chrism, which is not the one used by the great church. Only we (the Gnostics) are Christian, because we were united by this particular chrism and separated from the "evil/demon" of carnal lust (cf. V,9, 22; Wendland, 102) and from the "mixture" (that is the world, cf. V,7,39; Wendland, 88, 19). Perhaps these groups of Naasenes, who were found in Babylon and who practiced their baptismal rites in the Euphrates, may have been Baptists from Mani's environment.

Sethian baptism was a rite that took as a model the Logos and what the Logos did after accomplishing the redemption of the world, which is described in very singular terms. To liberate the spirit (*nous*), prisoner of matter, Logos took the form of a slave, being born like a man according to Philippians 2.7. According to the Sethian author quoted in the text, the Logos took the shape of a snake—the shape which should have allowed Logos to enter the inferior world of darkness. That is why Logos entered a virgin's womb, and, after having overcome the pain that reigned in the world of darkness, washed himself and drank the cup of living water, the springing up water that must be drunk by whoever wishes to divest himself of the shape of a slave and assume celestial clothing. Like Logos, then, who to free himself from the condition of a slave washed himself and drank a cup of living water, man has to wash himself and drink the living water in order to free himself from the human condition and the conditioning imposed by the body. It is not clear, though, if the washing and drinking have a symbolic or real significance. In any case, the living water that allowed Logos, and allows the Gnostics, to divest themselves of the condition of slave, in this context, is the *gnosis*.

The baptism of the followers of Justin, the author of the *Book of Baruch*, also had a paradigmatic value. This was represented by the initiation of Elohim, the creator of the world, into the "mystery" of the Supreme God. In the system of this sect there was also a third principle, which was, by nature, feminine, and was called Eden or Israel. Elohim loved Eden and through her begot twelve angels, who created man and placed in him the spirit (*pneuma*) of Elohim and the soul (*psychē*) of Eden (see *Elenchos* V,26,10). After having created the world, Elohim ascended to the higher world, where he took his place beside the Supreme God. Elohim left Eden on Earth. The myth told of two things: firstly, of the

work of the angel Baruch sent to Earth by Elohim to free the spirit which had been imprisoned in mankind, and, secondly, of the initiation of Elohim by God. This was the model of initiation which had to be followed by members of the sect. They had to swear not to leave the Supreme God to return to the world of Earth. Then they had to bathe in "living water" and drink from a cup of this water, in the same way as Elohim had done. This was opposed to those men, who are *psychikoi* and *hylikoi*, who bathe in the water that comes from the Earth, that is, the water which derives from evil creation (V,27,1). Hence, the two inferior classes wash themselves in material water, whereas Gnostics wash themselves in the living water: the *gnosis*.

Conclusion

We return, now, to the second point in the definition of purification according to the Mani logion, namely: the purification is achieved through *gnosis* and includes the observance of the precepts of the Savior. Manichaean *gnosis*, then, is inseparable from morality. Both *gnosis* and the observance of the precepts of the Savior are required to gain the redemption of the soul: "You should keep the precepts of the Savior in order that he may redeem your soul from ruin and destruction." There should be no doubt, in light of the whole of our context, that the precepts of the Savior are those of the Encratite tradition, which are referred to in the diverse testimonies mentioned above (see the complete renunciation of the world in the *Testimony of Truth* 69, 22–24). On the other hand, the Baptists of Mani's community themselves were Encratite (cf. *CMC* 102,14: "those who have read on the purity, on the mortification of flesh"). Precepts of this order are the specific matter of some *logia Iesu*, quoted in the *Gospel of Thomas*: logion 22 ("Jesus said to them: 'When you make the two one…and when you make the male and the female one and the same, so that the male will not be male nor the female, female…'"); logion 27 ("Jesus said: 'If you do not fast as regards the world, you will not find the kingdom…'"); logion 37 ("Jesus said: 'When you disrobe without being ashamed and take up your garments and place them under your feet like little children and tread on them, then [will you see] the son of the living one, and you will not be afraid.'").[43] See also the moral precepts in the *Acts of Thomas*

[43] Robinson, *The Nag Hammadi Library*, 129f.

and in the older Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, in which the preaching of *enkrateia* aims at the restoration of the original condition,[44] and only in this way is *gnosis* the saving knowledge.

[44] See Han J. W. Drijvers, "The Acts of Thomas," *New Testament Apocrypha*, Revised Edition, W. Schneemelcher, ed. (English translation by R. McL Wilson) (Philadelphia, 2003), 327–29.

MANICHAEISM AMONG THE UYGURS: THE UYGUR KHAN OF THE BOKUG CLAN

Larry Clark
Bloomington

With a few exceptions, the rulers of the Uygurs had been Manichaeans since the middle of the 8th century when Sogdian Manichaeans converted Bügü Khan (759–770) who, after his accession in 759 proclaimed it to be the official religion of the Uygur Steppe Empire. Already by 755, the Uygurs began to incorporate the Tienshan-Tarim region into their realm, so that they had direct access to the sources of eastern Manichaeism in the northern Tarim cities and the church, in turn, could enjoy more intimate contact with its Uygur patrons.[1]

The extent to which Bügü Khan sponsored the church's proselytization efforts in those initial years of 755 and later depends very much on how one interprets the following passage in U 01a, I verso, lines 01–07, which is an Uygur text written in Uygur script (US):[2]

> *{a}m{tı} täŋrikän uygur bokug xan kočogaru kälipän koñ yılka üč mahistāg olurmak üčün možakka keŋäti*
>
> {Now}, the Devout One, the Uygur Khan of the Bokug (clan), came to Kocho and arranged with the Teacher for the settling of three Presbyters (in the steppe) in the Sheep year.

This and the other remaining fragments of text U 01 contain material belonging to a history of the Uygurs from the Manichaean perspective. In the passage quoted above, there is a clear reference to an Uygur ruler who went to the city of Kocho in the Turfan basin to arrange for three Manichaean Presbyters to establish a mission in the steppe. The

---

[1] I dealt with the conversion of this ruler extensively in my article "The Conversion of Bügü Khan to Manichaeism," *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli* 1997, R. E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, P. Zieme, eds. (Berlin, 2000), 83–123. The present paper takes up the problem of U 01 which I broached but did not treat on 114–115 of that article.

[2] A. von Le Coq, "Ein manichäisches Buch-Fragment aus Chotscho," *Festschrift Vilhelm Thomsen zur Vollendung des siebsigsten Lebensjahres an 25. Januar 1912* (Leipzig, 1912), 145–154.

inference that the mission is to be carried out in the steppe is based on the assumption that there would be no reason to state that an Uygur ruler from the Western Uygur Empire after 840 would travel to Kocho to arrange for such a mission. Nonetheless, two important questions remain in the interpretation of this passage. First, who was the *uygur bokug xan*? Second, which Sheep year is mentioned in the passage?

It is tempting to assume that *uygur pwqwγ xan* of this passage refers to the Uygur ruler Bügü Khan who first was drawn to Manichaeism around 755 and who established it as a state religion in 759 or so. However, the spelling *pwqwγ* has bothered all commentators and has given rise to alternative interpretations of the identity of this figure.[3] There are two unrelated issues in contention: (1) Could the spelling *pwqwγ* ever be shown to be an aberrant writing of *pwykw* = *bügü*, and thus a means of identifying the two as the same person? (2) Could the person called *pwqwγ xan* in this text ever be shown to be the same person as the familiar *pwykw xan* = *bügü xan* of other texts, regardless of the clear difference in the two names? With respect to the first issue, it is dubious that any amount of linguistic legerdermain can equate *pwqwγ* and *pwykw*, not only because the first is a back-vowel word and ends in—*γ* in US, but because the first potentially could be interpreted either as *bokug*, 'withdrawn; secluded,' or—although unlikely, as we shall see—as *boguk*, 'crop (of a bird); gnarl (of a tree); swelling,' and therefore is different in form and meaning from *bügü*, 'sage, wizard.' Before turning to issue (2), it is important to understand what the word written *pwqwγ* actually might refer to.

At first glance, one might attempt to identify the word spelled *pwqwγ* in this spot as the noun *boguk*, 'crop of a bird, craw; swelling, goiter; bud of a flower,' that is derived from *bog-*, 'to choke; to restrict,' as a subject noun meaning 'what chokes' or 'what restricts' the air in a throat or the growth of something. The form *boguk* originally might have been *bogak* with *-a-*, as attested in Ottoman, Chagatay, Kazak *bogak*, Kirgiz *bokok*, Teleut, Altay, Kirgiz *pogōk*, Lebed *pōk*, ETurki *pukak*, Shor

[3] While Le Coq and others thought that *pwqwγ xan*, despite the linguistic difficulty, was a reference to Bügü Khan, Abe contended that *pwqwγ xan* was an epithet for Täŋritä ülüg bulmš alp kutlug ulug bilgä xagan (r. 795–808), who was called "Huaihsin"; for a summary of Abe's views on the Uygurs, see "Where was the Capital of the West Uighurs," *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun-Kagaku-Kenkyusyo Kyoto University* (Kyoto, 1954), 435–450. An excellent survey of this question may be found in Y. Kasai, "Ein Kolophon um die Legende von Bokug Kagan," *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 19 (2004): 9–17.

pugak, and Azeri *buxaġ*.[4] It is found in an US medical text as *pwqwq* or *pwqwγ* and in a clipped form in a Brahmi Script medical text as *pūq* = *buk*, 'crop.'[5] Despite the spelling with *-u-* in Brahmi Script and the occurrence of some modern variants with *-u-*, the word must be derived from *bog-*, itself the root of other derivations with *-o-*,[6] so that the vowel is *-o-* in the root.

Some scholars have interpreted the word *boguk* ~ *bogak*, 'crop; swelling, goiter; bud of a flower,' also as 'knot, protuberance, gnarl,' the latter meaning a hardened swelling on a tree. Their reason for doing so is the perceived affiliation of a word meaning 'gnarl, swelling' with the myth of the eponymous founder of the Uygurs, as told in several Chinese sources and in the Persian history of Juvaini.[7] According to this myth, between the Selenge and Tugla rivers there was a tree on which a 'gnarl' ('swelling' in Juvaini) appeared and grew larger and larger. Inside this swelling were five children, the fifth and best of whom was named Boguk Khan (as represented in Chinese sources) or Boku/Buku Tegin (as represented in Juvaini). One understands why the 'gnarl' or 'swelling' of this tree could be understood as a reflection of the word *boguk*, 'crop, swelling, goiter,' and thereby taken to be the origin of the name Boguk Khan, the best of the five children inside the 'gnarl' or 'swelling.' At the same time, one understands that once an equation between the word *boguk* 'crop' and the 'gnarl' or 'swelling' of the myth is accepted as a factum, then the word *boguk* becomes established among scholars as the form of the name they cite as Boguk Khan. However, we should remember that this is a myth, one recounted some three to five centuries after the events narrated in U 01, and that false or "folk" etymologies are a common occurrence in myths and in scholastic exercises. Moreover, we should be suspicious of any attempt to derive the name scholars cite as Boguk Khan from a feature of the myth rather

---

[4] W. Radloff, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte* (Sanktpeterburg, 1911), Vol. IV, 1264, 1265, 1361, 1362, 1646, 1650; M. Räsänen, *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen* (Helsinki, 1969), 79; S. Çagatay, Divanü Lûgat'te "Bukuk", Türk Dili 1: 253, 1972, 55.

[5] G. R. Rachmati, *Zur Heilkunde der Uiguren II*, SPAW 1932 (Berlin), 424; A. von Gabain, *Türkische Turfan-Texte VIII: Texte in Brāhmischrift*, ADAW 1952, Nr. 7 (Berlin, 1954), 57, 60 n. 2.

[6] For example, the verb ***bog-*** also is the root of ***bogus***, 'throat, crop,' which is spelled ***bho gzi***, 'crop,' in the same text, that is, with ***-o-*** instead of ***-u-***; see von Gabain, *Türkische Turfan-Texte VIII*, 57.

[7] The various versions of this myth have been conveniently summarized by Kasai, "Ein Kolophon," 9.

than to understand that this feature of the myth is an attempt to explain the name scholars cite as Boguk Khan. In fact, the name spelled *pwqwγ xan* in U 01 also could be interpreted as Bokug Khan.

The word *boguk* or *bokug* (or even *bokuk*) and the legend itself also appear in three Uygur sources, two of which may be from the early 11th century and the third of which from the 14th century, and thus contemporary to the versions in Chinese and in Juvaini. To begin with the latest source, the word occurs in line II.29 of a Chinese-Uygur inscription dated 1334 in the phrase *bokuk tözlüg pundarik čäčäk ong tegin bägi* which Hamilton had translated "Ong Tigin Bägi, la fleur de lotus de la souche de Boquq," seeing here a reference "au *célèbre* Boquq Qaγan."[8] Zieme proposed that *bokuk* is not a name in this passage, but is used to characterize the lotus flower; thus, "the lotus flower originating as a bud."[9]

The second occurrence of *bokug* is found in a colophon to a Buddhist text edited by Kasai: U 971, v14–15 *ud[ ] ugušnuŋ ud[u]mbar len[hua]sı bokug töznüŋ punḍarik čäčäki täŋrikän takın kız täŋrim*. Kasai translated this phrase as "T(ä)ŋrikän Takın Kız T(ä)ŋrim, die (wie) die Udumbara-Blume, die Bokug-Ursprung habende *Puṇḍarīka*-Blume des . . . Stammes ist."[10] The damaged name of the clan or tribe (*uguš*) possibly could be restored as *ud[an]* which appeared as Wou-tan in the Chinese parallel to the Uygur passage in the 1334 inscription. Hamilton thought that this word was Mongol *uda(n)*, 'willow tree,' a meaning that he extended to 'gnarl of the willow tree.'[11] Without presuming to understand the Chinese transcription of a name, I nonetheless am confident that Mongol *uda(n)* cannot be brought into the discussion of the phrase in U 971, let alone of the origin myth of the Uygurs. However, in this text, the grammar is transparent and the phrase may be understood literally as "the lotus flower of the *bokug*-origin," not as "the lotus flower of the bud-root (origin)" which makes little sense.

---

[8] Geng Shimin and J. Hamilton, "L'inscription ouïgoure de la stèle commémorative des Iduq Qut de Qočo," *Turcica* 13 (1981): 27, 35.

[9] See P. Zieme, "Uygur Yazısıyla Yazılmış Uygur Yazıtlarına Dair Bazı Düşünceler," *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belletin* 1982–83, 234; here, Zieme read *täg* instead of *ong*, *bäg* instead of *bägi*).

[10] See Kasai, "Ein Kolophon," 3–4.

[11] Geng-Hamilton, "L'inscription," 35; cf. *Mongolian-English Dictionary*, F. D. Lessing, ed. (Berkeley, 1960), 860: *uda*, 'willow-tree.'

The third attestation of *bokug* in Uygur sources also is found in a colophon to the Buddhist text SI D/17 (unavailable to me) which Kasai published as follows:[12]

> *kam l(a)n čuin atl(ı)g bärk arg ičintä ı-da törüp ötigän yerintä b(ä)lgürüp bešägün örgün üzä bädümiš yer-dä t(ä)ŋri-tä ayag-l(ı)g ulug küčlüg t(ä)ŋri-l[är]-tä alkaš-l(ı)g udok bokug uguš-ta törü[y]ü y(a)rlıkamıš bodi tözlüg b(o)dis(a)v(a)t ugušl[ug]*
>
> hat er geruht … von dem großen mächtigen Göttern gepriesenen heiligen Bokug-Stamm … in dem … Hainwald namens Kaml(a)nčuin auf einem Baum entstand, im Ötigän-Land erschien und zu fünft auf dem Thron groß wurde, zu entstehen; er ist vom Bodhi-Wesen, er ist vom Bodhisattva-Geschlecht

Here, Kasai's interpretation of *pys'kwn* as *bešägün*, 'zu fünft,' runs counter to the very clear or sufficiently clear spellings of *pyz'kwn yazı* in U64+Mainz435b, r09, *pyz'kwn* in PC 2988, 01–02, and *pyz'kwn örgin* (~ *örgün*) in U251a, r04.[13] Kasai justifies this interpretation by referring to the Uygur myth of five boys born in a tree.[14] However, the occurrence of *pys'kwn* cannot be separated from the three occurrences of *pyz'kwn*, so that either *pys'kwn* stands for *pyz'kwn* (and therefore cannot be *bešägün*) or *pyz'kwn* stands for *pys'kwn* and, by another leap, *pys'kwn* stands for *bešägün*, a possibility that cannot be dismissed but one accompanied by many problems.[15] Neither Hamilton's attempt to turn Wou-tan into Mongol *uda(n)*, 'willow tree,' and the latter into 'gnarl of a willow tree,' nor Kasai's attempt to turn the name *bizägün* into *bešägün*, 'the group of five,' in order to connect more closely these occurrences of *bokug* to the legend of Bokug Khan, can be considered convincing at the present time.

Rather, the close connection between the word *bokug* and the Uygur origin legend may be established in another way. First of all, the fact that

---

[12] Kasai, "Ein Kolophon," 15.

[13] For U64+Mainz435b, see A. von Le Coq, *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho III, Nebst einem christlichen Bruchstück aus Bulayïq*, APAW 1922, Nr. 2, 40 Nr. 24 (U64); P. Zieme, *Manichäisch-türkische Texte*, Berliner Turfantexte 5 (Berlin, 1975), 59–60 n. 604 (Mainz 435); J. Wilkens, "Ein manichäisch-türkischer Hymnus auf den Licht-Nous," *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, Neue Folge 16 (1999–2000), 217–231. For PC 2988, see J. Hamilton, *Manuscrits ouïgours du IX^e–X^e siècle de Touen-houang, I–II* (Paris, 1986), 83–92. For U251a, see P. Zieme, *Manichäsch-türkische Texte*, 63–65 Nr. 29.

[14] Kasai, "Ein Kolophon," 15 n. 45.

[15] For example, *pyz'kwn* appears before *yazı*, 'plain,' and twice before *örgün* ~ *örgin*, 'throne,' in these texts, so that it must be the name of a locale or something similar, rather than a collective numeral.

SI D/17 refers to an unnamed ruler who was born in a tree and was from the *bokug*-clan requires a new perspective on SI D/17, as well as on the legend itself. This reference cannot be to an actual ruler who both was born in a tree *and* was from the *bokug*-clan, but must be a reference to the original myth itself according to which the eponymous founder of the Uygurs was born in a tree and also was from the *bokug*-clan. In other words, Bokug was the name of an *uguš*, 'family, clan, tribe,' *not* of a ruler from any period of Uygur history. The fact that the word *bokug* occurs before the word *uguš*, 'family, clan,' in SI D/17 ensures that *bokug* is the name of a clan and cannot be taken as the name of a ruler named Bokug/Boguk Khan in a (modern) myth.

In this light, the name Bokug Khan in U 01 should be understood as "the Khan of the Bokug (clan)" instead of as "the Khan (named) Bokug." We should treat the name Boku Tegin in Juvaini according to the same understanding.[16] According to the Persian historian's version of the myth, Boku Tegin was the designation of the best of the five children born in the mound between two trees.[17] Thus, *boku tegin* has the same structure as *bokug xan*, and also as the phrases *bokug uguš*, '*bokug*-clan/tribe' and *bokug töz*, '*bokug*-root/origin' noted above. As we shall see, the similarity between the word *boku* or *bokug* and the word *bokug* that meant 'crop; swelling' either is fortuitous or due to the twisted trail of a false etymology.

In my view, the word *bokug* in the Uygur sources cited above and the word *boku* in Juvaini must be the same as the ethnonym of the second of the Nine Oguz tribes (the first was Uygur) cited in the Chinese *T'ang Hui-yao* as *p'u-ku* = Buku, according to Pulleyblank and Senga, or Boku, according to Hamilton, and also the same as the ethnonym *bākū* cited in the Stäel-Holstein scroll in Khotanese Saka.[18] As Senga has empha-

[16] Henceforth, I use only Boku and Boku(g) and Bokug, but of course the vowel could be ***-u-*** instead of ***-o-*** in each of these forms.

[17] J. A. Boyle (trans.), *The History of the World-Conqueror by ʿAla-ad-Din ʿAta-Malik Juvaini, I* (Cambridge, 1958), 55–56.

[18] See E. G. Pulleyblank, "Some Remarks on the Toguzoghuz Problem," *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 28 (1956): 39; T. Senga, "The Toquz Oghuz Problem and the Origin of the Khazars," *Journal of Asian History* 24 (1990): 58; J. Hamilton, "Toquz-Oγuz et On-Uyγur," *Journal asiatique* 250 (1962): 27. Lacking expertise in Chinese, I do not know whether the Chinese scriptions stand for Boku or for Bokug. While Khotanese ***bākū*** and Persian ***boku*** might indicate the form with open syllable, the occurrence of ***bokug*** in Uygur sources points to a closed syllable, whether or not that is due to a false etymology. Generally, Uygur / Oguz ethnonyms cannot be given any sort of realistic etymology, primarily because they were adopted from the ethnonyms of peoples assimilated by the Turkic-speakers of the Uygur / Oguz tribes.

sized, the ethnonyms in these sources also could be interpreted as the family names of the heads of the leading clans of these tribes.[19] It may be recalled that the major migration of Uygurs to the Tienshan region occurred in 866 under the leadership of an Uygur named P'ou-kou-tsiun who established the western empire of the Uygurs with his capital at Beshbalik.[20] Needless to say, the identity of Bokug Khan in U 01 and this founding leader cannot be the same, as Manichaeism already had been established more than a century before that migration.

The relevance of P'ou-kou-tsiun to this question is that it shows once again that Boku or Boku(g) was the surname of the leader or possibly the ethnonym of the major tribe of the Nine Oguz which also were referred to as the Nine Surnames in Chinese. This leads one to suspect that the Uygur "tribe" was not itself a tribe, even though it was listed as such in the Chinese sources. Rather, because it was the first in the list of nine surnames of the Oguz (i.e. the Tokuz Oguz), the name Uygur may have stood for the set of ten clans (cited as On Uygur in sources) that made up the Boku(g) tribe which appeared second in the list. Several scholars have made a relevant argument in order to explain a reference to the Uygur Khagan and the "17 chieftains" of the Nine Oguz. According to both Pulleyblank and Czeglédy, one must subtract Uygur from the list of Nine Oguz tribes, leaving eight tribes, and the Yaglakar clan from the list of Ten Uygur clans, leaving nine clans, to arrive at the figure of "17 chieftains."[21] A slightly different explanation is that the Boku(g) tribe of the Nine Oguz consisted of ten clans or the Ten Uygur. Subtraction of the set of those ten clans from the Nine Surnames of the Oguz leaves the Eight Oguz (a term that occurs in the Shine-usu inscription) and subtraction of either the Yaglakar or the Boku(g) clan from the Ten Uygur leaves nine other clans, or 8 + 9 = 17. Such an interpretation explains the prominence of the Boku(g) clan in the myth about the foundation of the Uygurs, as well as in the history of the Western Uygur Empire.[22]

---

[19] Senga, "The Toquz Oghuz Problem," 60.

[20] See the French abstract of T. Moriyasu , "Nouvel examen de la migration des Ouïgours au milieu du IX^{e} siècle" [in Japanese], *The Toyo Gakuho: The Journal of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 59 (1977): 105–130.

[21] See Pulleyblank, "Some Remarks," 41, and K. Czeglédy, "On the Numerical Composition of the Ancient Turkish Tribal Confederations," *Acta Orientalia Hungaricae* 25 (1972): 278–279.

[22] I do not take into consideration the so-called "Türgeš coins," one of which bears the title Kül Bilgä Bokug Uygur Khagan, on which see the recent article of Thierry, "Les monnaies de Boquq qaghan des Ouïghours (795–808)," *Turcica* 30 (1998): 263–278. In

On the basis of the considerations presented above, I propose that *uygur pwqwγ xan* in U 01 should be interpreted as the "Uygur Khan of the Bokug (clan)" rather than the "Uygur Khan (named) Bokug." Since the identity of this Uygur ruler is not carried by the phrase itself, and since no Uygur ruler ever bore just the name Bokug (without *xan*, *uguš* or *töz*), identification of this ruler can only be accomplished by that kind of argument commonly known as persuasion. In fact, following in the footsteps of Abe's ground-breaking study of Uygur history, scholars have dismissed even the possibility that the word *boku(g)* ever could have referred linguistically or historically to Bügü Khan (r. 759–779), and instead have almost uniformly attached it to the Uygur ruler with the title Täŋritä ülüg bulmıš alp kutlug ulug bilgä xagan (r. 795–808) who was called "Huai-hsin" in Chinese.[23]

Why? After all, it is certain that no source ever equated this "Huai-hsin" (or Bügü Khan or any other Uygur ruler) with a name or word like *boku(g)*. Two arguments are advanced by proponents of this identification: (1) "Huai-hsin" engineered a transfer of power from the Yaglakar clan to the Ädiz clan (whose identity has never been established in a satisfactory manner); and (2) he also restored Manichaeism to its official status as state religion after the anti-Manichaean period that began with Bügü Khan's murder in 779. As for the first of these, Chinese sources attest that "Huai-hsin" himself was a Yaglakar, and that only scions of the Yaglakar clan were sent to T'ang courts as hostages, which clearly implied their continuing royal status.[24] In fact, the "Ädiz power move" may have been a subterfuge or only a temporary state of affairs, for it should not be forgotten that at some unknown date the Yaglakar clan regained official control and retained its charismatic power in the Tienshan in the 13th century. In any case, no connection has been established between the change of clans and Manichaeism among the Uygurs. Moreover, the ruler "Huai-hsin" evidently supported the Ädiz, which means that the Ädiz could not have been greatly if at all opposed to Manichaeism and that therefore the switch of clans was political in nature and held little or no relevance for the religion. It may be true

---

fact, this attempt to date and identify the ruler as the "Huai-hsin" (r. 795–808) in Chinese sources is based on an assumption supported only by the opinions of various scholars, but not on any attested reference to "Huai-hsin" as Bokug Khan/Khagan.

[23] As already noted, the history of this question was treated by Kasai, "Ein Kolophon," 9–14, who also mentioned a few cases of identifying the Uygur ruler in question with one or another ruler after 808.

[24] Kasai, "Ein Kolophon," 11.

that the official restoration of Manichaeism among steppe rulers could be ascribed to "Huai-hsin" following a brief period of official rejection, but we must consider the possibility that this fact is the sole argument for his imputed significance from the Manichaean perspective.

Indeed, it is instructive to weigh the relative importance of the two rulers, Bügü Khan and "Huai-hsin," to the version of Uygur history that is presented from the Manichaean point-of-view in the text U 01. Who (together with his brother) brought the trade routes along the Tienshan under Uygur control for the first time, thereby promoting Uygur power, fame, and enrichment in the region? It was Bügü Khan, not "Huai-hsin." Who decisively defeated the anti-T'ang rebels and placed T'ang in a subordinate relationship with the Uygurs? It was Bügü Khan, not "Huai-hsin." Who established an exploitative protectorship over T'ang that lasted until 840 and brought immeasurable riches to the Uygurs? It was Bügü Khan, not "Huai-hsin." Who established Manichaeism as the state religion of the Uygurs? It was Bügü Khan, not "Huai-hsin," who only rehabilitated what Bügü Khan had founded. Who brought Manichaean clerics and missionaries to the steppe for the first time? It was Bügü Khan, not "Huai-hsin." Who supported the first translations of Manichaean texts into Uygur, thus making proselytization possible? It was Bügü Khan, not "Huai-hsin." Who was the subject of one of the most famous texts of the period (U 72–U 73, the "Reaffirmation" text),[25] one that demonstrated a personal knowledge of the man rather than of an abstract or mythological figure? It was Bügü Khan, not "Huai-hsin." I have invoked this "litany of injustice" accorded to the fame and acclaim of Bügü Khan primarily to emphasize that any subsequent ruler of the Uygur Steppe Empire pales in importance next to him from the Manichaean perspective. In my view, a more persuasive candidate than Bügü Khan cannot be found for the "the Uygur Khan of the Bokug (clan)" in U 01.

If that identification can be accepted, then U 01 (much as comparable portions of the Karabalgasun inscription) may be seen as a primary historical document that chronicles events in the steppe from the final years of the Second Türk Dynasty (692–744) to at least the establishment of the Uygur Steppe Empire (744–840) and its extension westward to the Tienshan in the 750s. This brings us to the second

[25] See W. Bang and A. von Gabain, *Türkische Turfan-Texte, II. Manichaica*, SPAW, Phil.-Hist. Klasse 1929 (Berlin, 1929), 411–422; L. Clark, "The Conversion," 101–104.

piece of unexplained evidence in U 01, namely the reference to the Sheep year which, rigorously, could have been 755, 767, 779 and so on in a 12-year cycle. The interpretation of "the Uygur Khan of the Bokug (clan)" as a reference to Bügü Khan would support viewing that Sheep year as 755, and it happens that our evidence places the future Bügü Khan in the Tienshan area in 755.[26]

Even if we concede that Manichaean Presbyters could have been sent to the steppe as early as the years 755 or later, we lack the kind of documentation needed to gauge the extent of Manichaean conversion there or anywhere in the eastern region of Central Eurasia. Nonetheless, we can infer from sources that the church, elated by the power wielded by their new convert, anticipated much success in proselytizing among the peoples in the steppe subject to the Uygurs. The Karabalgasun inscription specifies that after Bügü Khan reconfirmed his acceptance of the religion in 763:[27]

> The king of the religion (*fa-wang*), having been apprised that [the Uygurs] had accepted the true religion, strongly praised their respectful [...] (and) sent the Elect brothers and sisters to enter into the kingdom in order to spread and exalt [the religion] there. Then the throng of disciples of the Teacher (*mojǐk*) traversed the land in all directions from east to west, and came and went, preaching the religion.

Manichaean clergy in Kocho set about preparing numerous works in the Turkic language of the Uygurs.[28] These included service-books and hymnals for ritual life, catechisms for individual study and probably a history of the Uygurs and their most famous son, Bügü Khan. Such texts were written in the Manichaean script of the church, but also in the Runic script that the Uygurs used in their historical inscriptions in the steppe, as well as in the slightly adapted Sogdian script used by Karluks and Yagmas already in the Tienshan area. The majority reflect the bilingualism of their Sogdian compositors, not only in the orthography and grammar of the Uygur language used in the texts, but also in the inclusion of Middle Persian and Parthian hymns and passages in these books.

---

[26] See Clark, "The Conversion," 106–115.

[27] See É. Chavannes and P. Pelliot, "Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine, traduit et annoté," *Journal asiatique* 1913, 190–196.

[28] For the Turkic Manichaean corpus, see L. Clark, "The Turkic Manichaean Literature," *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 43 (Leiden, 1997), 89–141.

However, there is no evidence or reason to believe that conversion ever advanced far beyond the Uygur ruler and segments of his family, clan, entourage, and administration during the steppe empire. On the contrary, opposition to the new religion could have been one of the factors in the palace coup that resulted in the execution of Bügü Khan and his Sogdian advisers in 779, since Manichaeans also suffered grievously in the purge.[29] Although Manichaeism was restored to an official status under the rulers Ay Tängrite Ülüg Bulmıš Alp Kutlug Ulug Bilgä Khagan/Huai-hsin (795–808) and Ay Tängrite Kut Bulmıš Alp Bilgä Khagan/Pao-i (808–821), it surely served as one of the ideologies of the leadership and not as a belief system that integrated secular and religious life for the peoples of the realm. Its ideological role was manifested in the Turkic literature from Kocho, which presents numerous examples of the glorification of the Uygur rulers of the steppe. For example, in one text (TM 417 and TM 47 [M 919]), the composer clearly sought to divinize these rulers by comparing one ruler's death to the "sinking of the Sun God" and his enthronement to "the rising of the Moon God," so that enthronement itself was likened to a reincarnation of the supreme bodies of Light, resident in the Khan.[30] That these rulers accepted such symbols of their deification is evident from their titles which contained an element proclaiming that they had received their charisma or right to rule from the *kün tängri* 'Sun God' or the *ay tängri* 'Moon God' or both.[31] Church leaders in Kocho had everything to gain from their conscious divinization of the Uygur rulers in the far-off steppe. Deification may not have been the sincerest form of flattery, but it did help to ensure protection of missionary activities within the realm. However, apart from a few faint vestiges of their proselytizing efforts, Manichaeism disappeared from the upper steppe with the collapse of the Uygur Steppe Empire in 840.

---

[29] See C. MacKerras, *The Uighur Empire According to the T'ang Dynastic Histories. A Study in Sino-Uighur Relations, 744–840* (Columbia, 1973), 88.

[30] F. W. K. Müller, *Uigurica I*, APAW 1908, Nr. 2 (Berlin, 1908), 57; A. von Le Coq, "Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho III," 33–35 Nr. 15; Arat, "Der Herrschertitel *Iduq-qut*," *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 35 (1964): 150–157.

[31] Following the palace coup, the several Uygur rulers of the years 779–795 were not Manichaeans and did not carry the 'Moon and Sun Gods' element in their titles, with the very brief exception of Ay Tängritä Bolmıš Külüg Bilgä Xagan/Chung-chen (789–790); cf. MacKerras, *The Uighur Empire*, 88–107, 152–153 n. 146.

MANICHAEAN TIME-MANAGEMENT: LAYMEN BETWEEN RELIGIOUS AND SECULAR DUTIES

Iris Colditz
Berlin

Manichaean Ethics and the Division of the Tasks in the Community

The believer of any religion is obliged to perform a multitude of duties. Religious commandments regulate the ethical conditions of his life and call upon him to perform religious services. Nevertheless, the faithful one does not stand out of the society, since he has to fulfill also his social and family obligations according to his respective position. As a superior, he is responsible for his subordinates and has to ensure their maintenance; as an inferior, he has to act with respect and services towards his master. Moreover, of course, the believer is to earn his own living and that of his family members by following an occupation. All these duties occupy the believer's time, and sometimes this may bring him into a conflict as to which one of them shall take priority. For that reason, every religion develops its own instructions to enable its followers to meet all their commitments.

Manichaean ethics demanded from the believers to keep the so-called "three seals": of the mouth, of the hands, and of the lap. They consisted in purity of thoughts and words, food instructions, avoidance of any activities that could harm the Living Soul, which is the divine Light fettered in every part of the material world, and chastity.[1] By this, many kinds of occupations people used to earn their living, especially within the fields of agriculture, warfare, hunting, and craft, were regarded as aggressive against the Light, whereas those within

[1] For the "three seals" and the Manichaean commandments in the sources see: Augustine, *de moribus Manichaeorum* 20 (Rutzenhöfer 2004, 172–173); *Fihrist* 333 (Flügel 1862, 64, 95; Dodge 1970, II 789); M801a/p.13/6/ (Henning 1936a, 24, l. 205); *Xwāstwānīft* XV C (Asmussen 1965, 179, 199); Chin. *Hymnscroll* 387–400 (Tsui Chi/Henning 1943, 213–214; Schmidt-Glintzer 1987, 62); *Keph.* 192.3–193.22 (Polotsky/Böhlig 1940); *PsBk* 115–116 (Allberry 1938). For a general overview on Manichaean ethics and commandments see Klimkeit 1989, 52–56; Tardieu 1981, 79–89; Böhlig 1980, 40–44; Sims-Williams 1985b.

the fields of commerce, finance, administration and book production were considered as harmless. Standing in the Gnostic tradition, the Manichaean mission was directed at the urban educated classes, but it must have had also its numerous followers among the common people to enable the Manichaean religion an existence across the world and through the centuries.[2]

The Elect and their Continuous Religious Work

However, not all members of the community could fulfill these ethical precepts. The Manichaean parishes had therefore a hierarchical structure, and there existed a clear division of tasks between the two main groups of this community: the clerics (Elect) and the laymen (Hearers). Both of them had to observe several religious commandments which differed in intensity. The clerics followed five very restrictive regulations, handed down in several versions in Western and Eastern Manichaean sources.[3] They were forbidden to lie, to kill, to eat flesh and to drink alcohol, to have sexual intercourse and to accumulate personal possessions. Thus purified they were able to fulfill their religious duties, which they did exclusively. Their whole day was devoted to prayers and hymns, until they gathered in the evening for the "Table of God," the cultic meal that served the redemption of the Light from material bondage. Several times of the year the Elect also performed fasts of varying duration and the confession of sins. "For this reason it is not permitted for them to do any work. . . . For this reason they are forbidden to carry out an occupation."[4]

Many Manichaean sources describe how the clerics devoted themselves continuously to liturgical and ritual practice, to teaching, mission and pastoral duties and, of course, to the keeping of the religious commandments.

> To fulfill completely, oh God, your counsels and your commandments, I shall strive and wait (on you). I am ardent, by day and by night. (M39/v/ii/8–11, Parthian)[5]

---

[2] For a summary with further references see Colditz 2000, 36–37.
[3] Sims-Williams 1985b, 573–577.
[4] *Acta Archelai* X.7 (Latin) and X.28.8 (Greek) (Vermes 2001, 55, 157).
[5] Andreas/Henning 1934, 885, ll. 70–73; Klimkeit 1993, 59.

> I pray day and night, lead my soul to the eternal paradise! (M77/r/14–15, Parthian)[6]

> …this being the daily work (of the men) of the religion. (That light) that ascends daily from the whole body of the Elect to the light [chariots] (= the sun and the moon); and the gods in command of these chariots draw it up [and] constantly send it on to the world of paradise. (Ch5554+Ch/U6914+So15000(5)/119–123, Sogdian)[7]

We also find descriptions of the continuous religious work of the Manichaean clergy in Eastern Manichaean sources which are mostly translations from Iranian languages. In the Chinese *Traité*, the fifth of the "Twelve Precious Trees of the Twelve Kings of Light," characterized by "zeal," expresses itself in the qualities of the Elect.

> …that the teachers and the bishops constantly produce an extraordinary merciful and warm consciousness, that they dwell peacefully and in harmony. (Traité Pelliot 569.16–571.2, Chinese)[8]

> Firstly, they shall not sleep, (in fear) they could be kept from the performing of actions which lead to perfectness. Secondly, they constantly rejoice to read and to recite, and they encourage their hearts in not becoming lazy. If those who study with them give instructions, they are attentive and grateful to them, and as a result of the instructions their hearts will not cause any anger. Their constant efforts also encourage the others. Thirdly, they are always glad to explain the pure and righteous law. Forthly, they recite the hymns according to the rites, and what they have recited they write down and repeat in their minds. In this way, there is no moment at any time which would be empty. Fifthly, they hold on to the commandments and do not stumble. (Traité Pelliot 578.7–20, Chinese)[9]

Characteristic idiomatic expressions, like "constantly" (Chin. *ch'ang*), "daily" (So. *ptmyδy*), "every day" (So. *wyspw myδ*) or "day and night" (Pa. *šab ud rōž, pad rōž ud pad šab*) are often used in this context, which underline the continuity of religious service. It is interesting, that some of the Iranian idioms have already been in use for a very long time, since we find for example OP. *xšapavā raucapativā*, "by night or by day"

---

[6] Andreas/Henning 1934, 887; Klimkeit 1993, 57.

[7] Sundermann 1985, 27, ll. 119–123; Klimkeit 1993, 181.

[8] Chavannes/Pelliot 1911, 569–570; Schmidt-Glintzer 1987, 94, as 84b15–17. For parallels see: (Pa.) M1848/r/5–7/ (Sundermann 1992c, 52, 69, §45); (Copt.) *Keph.* 89.18–102.12 (Polotsky/Böhlig 1940); (Turk.) Klimkeit/Schmidt-Glintzer 1984, 90–91.

[9] Chavannes/Pelliot 1911, 578; Schmidt-Glintzer 1987, 96–97, as 85a2–9.

in the meaning of "continuously, always" in Darius' inscription at Behistūn.[10]

Religious Obligations of the Hearers

Far less is told in the texts in detail about the laymen. Like the Elect, the Manichaean Hearers ought to observe a number of religious rules. Their behavior as a Manichaean believer was laid down in ten commandments, which were less restrictive than those of the clerics. These rules contained the renunciation of idolatry, lying, greed, killing, fornication, theft, teaching of pretences and sorcery, of standing in two opinions (concerning the religion) and of slackness and negligence of work.[11]

The tasks of the Elect and the Hearers complemented each other. While the laymen were allowed to eat meat if they had not killed the animal by themselves, and to have sexual intercourse with their wives or husbands respectively but to prevent procreation and conception, the clerics lived an abstemious live.[12] The most important religious duty of the Manichaean Hearers consisted in the provision of the Elect with everything they needed for living. This enabled the latter to devote their whole time and attention to ceremonies of religious worship for the redemption of Light without any distraction by worldly obligations. The clerics for their part assured the laymen the salvation of their souls by doing all liturgical practice. Manichaean Hearers thus took their benefit from the work of the clerics. "By his life as serving auditor he is God's collaborator and contributes to God's and his own salvation. He possesses a living hope of being reborn as an Electus and after a life in abstinence to come to reside in the 'New Paradise'."[13] Therefore, the Hearers had to do "soul-service" by giving alms to the Elect of an amount of one tenth or one seventh of his property,[14] which consisted

[10] DB 1.19–20, with parallels in Skt. *kṣapas . . . usras* RV 6.52.15, 7.15.8 (Kent 1953, 119), which shows common more ancient roots in the Indo-European poetry language.

[11] The only complete list is given in the *Fihrist* 333 (Flügel 1862, 64, 95–96; Dodge 1970, II 789). Cf. Sims-Williams 1985b, 577–582 with further references.

[12] Augustine, *de haeresibus* c. 46 (MPL 42, 37–38) gives some interesting details on the life of the Manichaean Hearers. So he reports on these precepts, as well as on the negative Manichaean position towards agriculture and cattle breeding.

[13] Asmussen 1965, 15.

[14] Tardieu 1981, 87.

in the donation of food, clothing, lodging, and other services, such as building residences or courier and transport services. They could also do social work, i.e. to pay for the release of a slave or hostage or to give a relative to the church (as a servant).[15] It was regarded as a pious deed as well to donate money to the copying of the holy scriptures.[16]

The Manichaean laymen had also other canonical obligations. Among these were the four daily prayers, devoted to the four aspects of the Father of Greatness, God-Light-Power-Wisdom, and held before the sun following its course over the sky during the day and before the moon or the Pole Star during the night, or to the North direction on moonless nights.[17] Concerning the times of prayer of the Hearers, the sources do not agree in all details. The *Fihrist* lists them as: just after noon, mid-afternoon, just after sunset, and nightfall, which corresponds to the four public of the five daily prayers in Islam. Moreover, the enumerating of the prayers starts here with the noon-prayer as is usual for the Muslim liturgical day. "Thus, an-Nadīm's account describes the practice of Manichaeans who had apparently adjusted their prayer-times to coincide exactly with the four public and visible prayers of the Muslims."[18] Al-Bīrūnī also begins with the noon-prayer, but he indicates differing times of prayer: noon, nightfall, dawn and sunrise. They coincide with four of the seven prayers of the Elect who held their additional prayers at mid-afternoon, half an hour after nightfall and at midnight. Therefore, al-Bīrūnī's report may reflect an older Manichaean tradition, not affected yet by Muslim influence. The Manichaean liturgical day may have begun originally with nightfall.[19] From this information it becomes clear that the main time of the Hearer's religious activity

---

[15] *Keph.* 192.25–193.22 (Polotsky/Böhlig 1940), cf. also Sundermann 1977, 240–241. But Manichaean charity was restricted to one's own parish, as criticized by Augustine, *Enarratio in psalmum* 140, c. 12 (CCL 40, 2034–2035).

[16] Henning 1943, 59, ll. 230–233. For the so-called "donater's names" see Polotsky 1934, 25.16–19; Sundermann 1981, 80 n. 5, 104 n. 4; Sundermann 1992a, 73–74; Colditz 1995, 49–52.

[17] On the Manichaean prayers we find more detailed accounts in Arabic sources: in *Fihrist* 333 (Flügel 1862, 64–65, 96–97; Dodge 1970, II 790–791) and in al-Bīrūnī's *'Ifrādu l-maqāli fī 'mri z-zilāl*, "Treatise on telling time by means of shadow" (= *Rasā'ilu l-Bayrūnī* 2, Hyderabad/Dekkan 1367/1948, 175), with differing information. For a comparison of both, and further considerations on the times of the Manichaean prayers, see de Blois 2000, 49–54, with an overview on the sources, *ibid.* 50. Some information we owe also to Augustine, discussed by van der Lof 1969.

[18] de Blois 2000, 51.

[19] de Blois 2000, 51 refers to al-Bīrūnī (*Qānūn* I, 66–67), who tells that the course of the day started for the Manichaeans with nightfall.

was between sunset and sunrise, besides noontide. Every prayer started with a preparatory ablution, and consisted of several blessings to the apostle and to the gods. It was to be performed while prostrating oneself to the ground and rising again twelve times during every prayer. One can imagine that this occupied a certain part of the Hearer's time.

Other obligations of the Manichaean laymen consisted in the regular fasts and the confession of sins. The Hearers fasted on fifty Sundays and five times a year for two days continuously, as well as once a year for 30 days with a break after sunset, including two double-days of fasting (Yimki- and Mani-fasts) at the beginning and the end.[20] This corresponds partly to the precepts for the Elect, who fasted additionally on fifty Mondays. Therefore, the laymen had to keep about 90 days of fasting a year, which entailed not only restraining from food and drink but also sexual abstinence and resting from worldly activities. The institution of the confession of sins was to inform the believer about his status regarding Gnosis and redemption.[21] The laymen confessed their sins of the preceding week every Monday before the clerics, and of the past year during the Bēma-feast which was celebrated on the last four days of the "month of the law," a month of fasting, as the day of assembly, confession and remission of sins. This feast was to remind all Manichaeans of Mani's passion after 26 days of imprisonment. During that time, the Hearers could not follow their usual daily business, since they had to obey the "resting of the hands." Traveling, visiting, curing, writing, juridical proceedings or trading was not allowed on Monday.[22] It seems that the Hearers also fasted on the Bēma-day, but it is not clear

---

[20] *Fihrist* 333–334 (Flügel 1862, 65, 97; Dodge 1970, II 791); *Keph*. 191.31–192.3 (Polotsky/Böhlig 1940); *Keph*. 262.10–264.19 (Polotsky/Böhlig 1966); Xwāstwānīft XIV A (Asmussen 1965, 178, 198, 222); cf. also Henning 1945a; Sundermann 1975. For a discussion of the problems, see Reck 2004, 7–10; for a differentiation between Eastern and Western Manichaean traditions, see Wurst 1995.

[21] Asmussen 1965, 19. On Gnosis and following the commandments as preconditions for redemption see Polotsky 1935, 245. Joining the clergy, the Manichaean believer enjoyed general absolution (So. *γuwānwēčā*) for all sins of his hitherto life. But from then onwards, heavy sins would lead him to banishment from absolution and from the Manichaean community, loosing every hope for redemption (Henning 1936a, 12–13, 100).

[22] See the quotation from M5860. Reck (1997, 303; 2004, 127) supposes that this fragment reports on the Elect. The described activities may refer to obligations the clergy had to fulfill due to monastic economy. But trading reminds one also of a common profession among the laity. "Payment" (*parišmār*) as an obligation of the Hearer is also mentioned in M49/I/ (see below). For the social background of Manichaean adherents and the target groups of Manichaean mission see Sundermann 1984b, 283, 361 n. 2; Colditz 2000, 30–39.

whether this day was counted within the month of fasting or as an extra day. Several Manichaean sources report on the Hearer's situation at the Bēma-feast.[23] The whole day of the feast and the preceding night the Hearers spent together with the Elect in praying, singing hymns, and listening to admonitions and the reading of the scriptures.

> Read the strict commandment and the scripture, and teach wisdom, proper behavior, and precept on this day. On this day also do not go and come on the way, do not arrive nor depart, do not write the book and do not (heal) the body, [ ] legal case [ ] do not remember *expenses. (M5860/I/r/i/6–20, Parthian)[24]

> Blessed are the Elect and the Catechumens, who keep festival on this day and fast and pray and give alms, that they may reign in the New Aeon. (PsBk 25.27–29, Coptic)[25]

> He commanded the wise ones, who are the Elect(?), to preach unto the Catechumens [ ] for them this day in honor, they making festival(?) together, keeping watch in the night with the holy ones [ ] with their fruits in the presence of the [ ]. (PsBk 35.18–22, Coptic)[26]

> We now therefore make festival fulfilling thy holy day, passing the night in vigil in thy joy, o glorious one. (PsBk 41.16–17, Coptic)[27]

The Manichaeans had to fulfill these religious commandments and obligations for the sake of their souls. All believers, the clergy as well as the laity, saw themselves exposed to a permanent seduction by the powers of Darkness. Manichaeism took "sin terribly seriously"[28] and regarded it as an active power. Negligence of the religious commandments could have drastic consequences for their status within the Manichaean community and especially for the future fate of the soul: hierarchical debasement, exclusion from absolution, excommunication and consequently the imprisonment of the Light particles of the soul in

---

[23] For the feast of the Bēma see Henning 1936a, 9–16; Tardieu 1981, 90–93; Böhlig 1980, 42–43, 311 n. 127; Sundermann 1990, 136–137; Reck 2004, 27–35; Wurst 1995 and 1996. The sources differ in their statements concerning length and course of the feast.

[24] Reck 2004, 127, ll. 562–576; see also Reck 1997, 301; Sundermann 1984a, 232.

[25] Allberry 1938, 25; Wurst 1996, 70–71, verse 15, fol. 25.27–28.

[26] Allberry 1938, 35.

[27] Allberry 1938, 41; Wurst 1996, 102–103, verse 3, fol. 41.16–17. Cf. also a So. fragment on liturgy: So13500/v/1–4, "kw[ ] 'xšp'[ ] "γ'z my[δ] p'š oo "hang(?) [ ] night [ ] beginning of the da[y] wake/sing/fast(?)" (unpublished, cf. Reck 2006, 85 no. 87).

[28] Asmussen 1965, 15.

the Bōlos, the final prison of Matter.[29] The dark "thieves" permanently threatened the Soul of Light, which must be guarded like a "treasure." Therefore, it required a constant fight against those powers, and the believers needed to stay always aware of the divine nature of the Soul of Light. The Manichaeans ought to restrain themselves from bad thoughts, bad words and bad deeds, and especially from laziness in their religious duties.[30] A multitude of Manichaean texts (homilies, parables, hymns) are extant in which the believers are taught to keep the commandments, and in particular the Hearers to show diligence in giving alms to the Elect. Parables, for example, use the image of the man of low birth who reaches great honor through an extraordinary gift.[31] But also the rich one is called upon to contribute his share to it.

> The Hearer who gives alms (to the Elect) is like a man of low birth, who presents (his) daughter to the king. He reaches (a position of) great honor. (M101f/v/3–6, Middle Persian)[32]

> Wonderful is the rich one who [does] good deeds because his is drunk by the treasure. (M6020/II/v/ii/16–18, Parthian)[33]

Non-fulfillment of the religious demands, whether willingly or unwillingly, was judged as a sin, notwithstanding whether it was committed due to laziness and negligence or to poverty or physical powerlessness. In every case, the Manichaean had to ask for forgiveness, as it is clear from the confession formulas, for which see below.[34] We know at least from the Central Asian Manichaean communities of the 8/9th century that each group of the laity, the male and the female, had its headmaster or -mistress (MP. *niyōšāgbed*, So.f. *niγōšāk-patānč*) who supervised the fulfillment of religious duties by his or her subordinates.[35] The Chinese version of the Karabalgassun inscription (821 CE), about the introduction of Manichaeism in the Uyghur kingdom,[36] reports that after

---

[29] Asmussen 1965; Henning 1936a, 12; Böhlig 1980, 43–44; cf. also Chin. *Compendium* c7–c12 on the sinful Elect who is to be handled "like a dead person" (Haloun/Henning 1953, 195–196; Schmidt-Glintzer 1987, 74).

[30] For examples see Reck 1992, 342–345.

[31] For the symbolism see Sundermann 1976, 182; Colditz 2000, 194–196.

[32] Henning 1943, 59, 63–64, A.f(188–191); M221 gives the story in more detail, cf. ibid. 64 n.1; Sundermann 1973, 103–104, text 36.

[33] Colditz 2000, 223, 388.

[34] Cf. also Tardieu 1981, 88–89.

[35] M1/30, 127, 140 (Müller 1913, 34); cf. Tardieu 1981, 75.

[36] The Sogdian and the Turkish versions do not include this passage. For the inscription see Hansen 1930; Radloff 1895, 291–298; Schlegel 1896, 18.

a relapse of the converted king supervisors (Turk. *tavratγučï*) had been appointed who watched over the religious morals and especially over the alms-giving for the Elect.[37] Disobedience of the Hearers towards the Elect was also considered a sin, since the latter should be honored in the same way as one's "masters and rulers," and the laymen were afraid to neglect their commandments.[38] The religious authorities of the Manichaean church are often praised in the manner of a king and his courtiers, while the laymen can be compared with the subjects.[39] For all these reasons, the Manichaean Hearers lived in the expectation of hard penalties for their sins during the final judgment. Several Manichaean texts give an insight into the idea of punishment of the sinners, which appear to originate in Sasanian criminal law. The described penalty methods correspond to those applied to apostates by Sasanian authorities as well as to the demons in the Manichaean myth.[40]

The Secular Obligations: Taxes, Services, Livelihood

So far, we have been considering the religious sphere. But on the other side, the Manichaean Hearers were also heavily obliged to the secular sphere. Paying less taxes or the non-fulfillment of services for the king and the nobility led to considerable consequences for the legal and social position of a Hearer, and negligence of his occupational duties worsened the material living conditions of himself and his family. The parable in M101f and M221 quoted above describes just this ideal of the subject loyal to the king, which has a Manichaean reinterpretation as the generous Hearer. The term "poor, powerless, of low birth" (MP. *išk̄oh*, Pa. *iskōh*) used here for the Hearer is even the same as for the class of rural population obliged to services and taxes.[41] But we may suppose that, because of the Manichaean ethic, most of the laymen

[37] Klimkeit 1989, 25–27; Bang and von Gabain 1930, 412.

[38] M8251/I/r/8–13 (MP.) *u-šān pad padixšar dārēnd čā'ōn kē xwēš xwadāw<an> ud xwadāy dārēh ud tirsēnd framān īg awišān widārādan ud ō ēn nihuftagīhān ud wuzurgīhān wihorīdan ī-šān pad wisp zamān aziš ašnawēnd* (Andreas/Henning 1933, 309).

[39] Colditz 2000, 367–373.

[40] For this problem see Colditz 1998.

[41] Colditz 2000, 190–196, 204–208.

did not make their living as a farmer or cattle-breeder but as a trader, businessman or other sorts of urban professional.[42]

On taxes and other obligations in the time of early Manichaeism we owe our information to Jewish sources like the Babylonian Talmud, as well as to the Arabic historians. They describe the economic circumstances in Babylonia in the first centuries CE.[43] Landowners had to pay land-tax (Aram. *ṭasqā* < Gr. τάξις?, besides MP. *harāg*, Arab. *ḫarāǧ*)[44] of about 1/6 to 1/3 of the earnings in cash or in kind at a fixed time. A certain part of this tax had to be paid to the king as the "king's share" (Aram. *mᵉnātā dᵉmalkā*). In the case that the tax debtor did not or could not pay, the land was confiscated and sold, or the owner had to lease or mortgage it. In the final consequence farmers also migrated to the cities.[45] The leaseholder for his part had to pay rent of different kinds to the lessor. Another obligation consisted in the poll tax (Aram. *kargā*; MP. *gazīd*, *gazīdag*, Arab. *ǧizya*). Additional burdens were made for the provision of material, equipment, and supply for state projects, the civil servants, or the armed forces. Commercial businessmen paid also customs duty on traffic of goods and persons. Delay or unwillingness of payment resulted in the seizure of their assets.[46]

Debt is also frequently dealt with in the extant Sasanian legal texts, especially in the *Hazār dādestān*,[47] and must have been the subject of many legal proceedings, since the Sasanian legal practice contained very complicated regulations for its repayment. If the debtor was not able to pay his charges he was considered as "unable, incapable" (MP. *a-tuwānīg*) and "insolvent" (*an-ādān*) and with that also as dependent (*framān-burdār*). He had no or only limited legal competence, needing

---

[42] From Manichaean point of view, it seems more useful to be a money-lender than a farmer. Augustine, *Enarratio in psalmum* 140, c. 12 (CCL 40, 2034–2035).

[43] For the following see Klíma 1962, 33–38, 60 n. 79; Klíma 1957, 28–30, 49–50. The terms for "taxes" may have undergone some changes through time.

[44] For MP. *harāg* "(land-)tax," < Aram. *hᵃlāḵ* < Akkad. *ilku*, see Henning 1958, 41; Henning 1935. It is not clear what kind of tax this term referred to in Sasanian time. Macuch (1993, 259, 269–270) explains it as "'Pflichtleistung' für die Obrigkeit (Steuer?)," and translates MP. *harg ud bār* "Pflichten und Lasten." In Islamic times Arab. *ḫarāǧ* was used for the land tax.

[45] The *Arda Wirāz nāmag* gives reference to the misery of the peasants as a result of excessive taxes (*harg-iz ī garān*), emerging from false land-survey. AWN 49.7–9 (Haug/West 1872, 181; 'Afifi 1342/1963, 52).

[46] For an overview of offences and appropriate penalties see Colditz 1998, 34–35.

[47] Part II: Macuch 1981; part I: Macuch 1993. For an overview on the sources of Sasanian legal literature see *ibid*. 2–7, for the many references to debts see Macuch 1993, 768–769 (index).

legal intercession (*ǰādag-gōwīh*) just like a woman, a minor, or a slave.[48] Some sources equate the insolvent one with the "poor, powerless" (*škōh*).[49] Non-payment of obligations could be punished by mutilation (*drōš*), which was the punishment for theft.[50] To pay his charges, the debtor could also commit himself or one of his relatives "with the body" (*pad tan*) for a fixed time to the service of the creditor who gained the revenues from his work.[51] However, this servitude of obligation led to a restriction or even loss of personal freedom. A Manichaean parable gives an impression of this state. In this, the debtors (Pa. *pār–burdān*, *purdagān*) are permitted to leave a country only after having paid their debts (*pār*). It distinguishes also between debtors with much and those with small debt.[52] The Zoroastrian *Dēnkard* (Book VI) makes an interesting reference to indebtedness as the result of non-fulfillment of one's duties (MP. *a-xwēš-kārīh*) – a hint at a possible negligence of tasks and services.

> …from not doing one's duty (there comes about) poverty; from poverty (there comes about) misery and insolvency for oneself and one's wife and slaves. (DkM 563.13–15, Middle Persian)[53]

The Conflict between Religious and Secular Duties: The Confession Formulas

The MP. text M49/I/r/ gives an account of the social and economic obligations of potential adherents to Manichaeism. A man who entered the community as a Hearer should ruminate upon his soul, although he continued to be concerned with his worldly affairs, like family, property,

---

[48] *PhlRivDd* 62.12 (Williams 1990, I, 222–223, 271; II, 108, 261). Cf. Bartholomae 1920, 53–54; Colditz 2000, 214–215.

[49] *Frahang ī Ōīm* 7 (Reichelt 1900, 197; Reichelt 1901, 122; Haug/West 1872, 59; Sundermann 1976, 180).

[50] It consisted of mutilation or branding of the condemned, possibly also in paying a fine. Cf. Macuch 1993, 495–496. For this kind of punishing a debtor see *Hazār dādistān* 3.5–6 (Macuch 1993, 54–57, 66–67).

[51] Macuch 1993, 401–402, 575.

[52] (Pa.) M 333/r/2–10: *naxwišt hō pār [čē] [an]dar im šahr ō wasān purd[ag] hēd, bēh tōžēd, ud paš išmā[h] ō kū š[ud]an kāmēd hēb šaw[ēd]. bēž hawīn kē āzād ahēnd, u-šā[n] andar hō šahr čiš pār nē ast, ab[āw] wistāf ud abē-tars pad hō pahrag bēh azihēd, u-šān hō bazakkar čiš kirdan nē šahēd* (Colditz 1987, 289–292, text 1.3, ll. 78–86; cf. also Colditz 2000, 98–99). The epimythion of the parable is in M334a (Colditz 1987, 292–297, text 1.4). But the differentiation in the amount of debt is interpreted here in a religious way referring to the grade of Gnosis.

[53] Sanjana 1874–1928, XII, 66; Shaked 1979, 164–165; Sundermann 1976, 185.

taxes, military service, or the pleasures of meat and beverages. The reverse of the fragment contains instructions according to Manichaean ethics and mentions the warrior and the peasant.

> …thus it is fitting, that he (i.e. the potential Hearer), just as he gives himself up to hate and protects the country (i.e. as a soldier) and does agriculture and makes payments and eats flesh and drinks wine and has wife and child and acquires house and property and cries for the body and pays taxes in the country and robs and damages and proceeds with oppression and mercilessness – (it is fitting that he) in the same way should also ask for the wisdom and knowledge of the gods and think of the soul. And also the one [who] more truly the affairs [ ] and does and [ ] house and [ ] truly [ ]…Like the warrior and worker[54] and also [ ] and the soul, but [ ] is. (M49/I/r/1–17, /v/13–16, Middle Persian)[55]

As it is already remarked above, a generous donation of alms was – besides prayers, fasting and the confession of sins – the most practicable way for the Manichaean Hearers to have an active influence on their redemption. But alms-giving appeared to be an additional charge for the laity. With too excessive alms they risked a neglect of their secular obligations, which applied to the so called "Perfect Hearer" who distinguished himself by strict ethics and an extraordinary almsgiving.[56] Therefore, the Manichaean laymen stood in a permanent conflict between the religious and the secular sphere. This conflict is expressed clearly enough in the Manichaean confession formulas.[57] The most important texts of this kind are the fragments of the *Bet- und Beichtbuch* in Middle Persian, Parthian and Sogdian,[58] and the Turkish *Xwāstwānīft* of which also Sogdian fragments are extant.[59] But while the former mainly concerns the Elect and contains only some fragments for Hearers,[60] the latter is

---

[54] Henning translates *ardīkkar ud warzīgar merd* "Wie jener streitbare und arbeitsame Mann…" But the recto side explicitly refers to agriculture and warfare. Therefore one can understand the phrase as a shortened version of *ardīkkar-merd ud warzīgar-merd* and compare with compounds like *āzād-mard* and *bandag-mard*. Both professions are otherwise metaphorically used, for example in parables.

[55] Andreas/Henning 1933, 306–307; Sundermann 1981, 93–94; Asmussen 1965, 27–28.

[56] For the "Perfect Hearer," see *Keph*. 228.5–234.23 (Polotsky/Böhlig 1940); Sundermann 1976, 182; Sundermann 1973, 87, 102–106, texts 36 and 37.

[57] For the origin of confession formulas in Old Mesopotamian times see Sundermann 1997c, 259–260, with further literature.

[58] Henning 1936a.

[59] Henning 1940, 63–67; Asmussen 1965.

[60] The Pa. fragmentary liturgy for Hearers, M5779 (Henning 1936a, 45–46, text c; for corrections see Reck 2004, 30–31, with parallels of the text in M1 and M782)

clearly directed to the laymen with many references to their worldly life. Besides, we have a number of confession prayers in several languages.[61] The formulas first mention the respective commandments, followed by the request for forgiveness for having violated it out of negligence, laziness, miserliness, or wretchedness. At the end, the words "We now, my God, pray to be liberated from sin; forgive my sin," in Turkish or Parthian respectively, are frequently used. This expresses the great worry of the Hearers of having not fulfilled their religious duties completely and honestly as demanded because of distraction by worldly duties. The following references concern the Hearers.[62]

> Concerning commandments: . . . if we should wittingly (or) unwittingly, as we . . . troubled about cattle and property . . . have broken these Ten Commandments . . . (Xwāstw. IX B, Turkish)[63]
>
> Concerning prayers: If for frailty and lack of fear of God, or [because I thought it more important to] plant and sow [I neglected my prayers . . .] (So10700b+So10701b/r/4–8, Sogdian)[64]
>
> Concerning alms: If we, either because of distress, or being miserly about giving alms, should not have been able to give the sevenfold alms to its full extent to religion, if we should have tied the light of the Fivefold God, which goes up to Heaven and is liberated, to house and property . . . (Xwāstw. XI B, Turkish)[65]
>
> Concerning fasts: And if we, as we, in order to maintain house and property, worried about (were occupied by) cattle and goods, or because our need and our distress supervened, . . . (or), as we were lazy and indolent (negligent), voluntarily (or) involuntarily should have broken the fast (or)

---

and the So. liturgy for the body-and-soul-rite, M114/I/ (Henning 1936a, 46–47). But these texts give mainly instructions on the course of the liturgies.

[61] The Chinese *Hymnscroll* 392–393, 410–414 (Tsui Chi/Henning 1943, 213–215; Schmidt-Glintzer 1987, 62–63, 66) gives only a general confession of offences against "the seven kinds of giving, the ten commandments, the three seals and the gate of the law." For a Chinese prayer of confession see Waldschmidt/Lentz 1926, 123, verse 387.

[62] In the *Bet- und Beichtbuch* the clerics for their part confess to having neglected their religious duties (prayers, hymns, confession of sins), to having not sufficiently thought about the purpose of their ritual evening meal and also to having broken the "three seals" by gardening, drinking alcohol, and possibly by sexual activities.

[63] Asmussen 1965, 197.

[64] Henning 1940, 66–67. Cf. the parallel in *Xwāstwānīft* X B: "And if we, being negligent without having fear (of God), should not have praised (prayed) correctly and completely and, while praising (praying), not have kept our hearts and our thoughts directed towards God, . . . (or) if somewhere there should have been something which obstructed (or) impeded, . . ." (Asmussen 1965, 197).

[65] Asmussen 1965, 197.

> further, while we were fasting, had not fasted correctly according to the religion and the doctrine…(Xwāstw. XII B, Turkish)[66]
>
> Concerning confession of sins: And should we not, voluntarily (or) involuntarily, as we were lazy and indolent (negligent), (or) as we mentioned business (or another) undertaking as a pretext, have gone to obtain forgiveness for (be liberated from) sin…(Xwāstw. XIII B, Turkish)[67]

Regulations for a Three-Part Division of the Course of the Day in Manichaeism and its Possible Origins

It becomes obvious that a real balance was required between the demands of the religion and the social and family affairs of the worldly sphere. Do we have any statement within the extant Manichaean sources with regard to this problem? Did there exist any practical regulations regarding how the Manichaean laymen should organize the course of their day and divide their time between their religious and worldly tasks – a kind of Manichaean time-management? A first hint can be actually found in the Arabic *Fihrist* of an-Nādīm, one of the most important sources on Manichaeism from Islamic times.[68]

> He (i.e. Mani) said: "He who would enter the religion must examine his soul. If he finds that he can subdue lust and covetousness, refrain from eating meats, drinking wine, as well as from marriage, and if he can also avoid causing injury to water, fire, trees, and earth, then let him enter the religion. But if he is unable to do all of these things, he shall not enter the religion. If, however, he loves the religion, but is unable to subdue greed and covetousness, let him seize upon guarding the religion and the Elect (i.e. to become Hearer), that there may be an offsetting of his unworthy actions, and times in which he devotes himself to work and righteousness, nighttime prayer, intercession, and pious humility (supplication). That will defend him during his transitory life and at his appointed time, so that his status will be the second status in the life to come." (*Fihrist* 332–333, Arabic)[69]

From this it becomes clear that the Hearer should reserve extra times (Arab. *auqāt*) of his day for pious deeds aside from fulfilling his secular

---

[66] Asmussen 1965, 197–198.
[67] Asmussen 1965, 198.
[68] The passage reminds one of M49 (see above) – a possible quotation from one of Mani's scriptures?
[69] Flügel 1862, 63, 95; Dodge 1970, II 788; Sims-Williams 1985b, 577.

duties. However, the text does not indicate an exact period. The Coptic psalm 15 gives more concrete advice. Although this passage may primarily concern the Elect,[70] it is an allusion to existing regulations for a Manichaean time-management. According to this psalm, the believer (the Elect?) should divide the night into three parts, to sleep one third, watch one, and meditate one. Here only religious obligations are mentioned.

> O man in whose hands is the Richness, why wilt thou slumber in this sleep? Wherefore wilt thou not divide for thyself the night into three parts and sleep for one, and watch for one, and ruminate with the rumination of the Living for one? Wherefore wilt thou not rise(?) betimes that thou mayest glorify the great Lives, before the [ ]. (PsBk 222.5–10, Coptic)[71]

The most detailed statement about the division of the Hearer's day between his obligations is made in the Sogdian text M135, a double sheet originally part of a miscellaneous manuscript. It also contains the parable of the pearl-borer with parallels in So18300, which Henning edited in his *Sogdian Tales*. It is ascribed to Mani himself, but this does not need to be authentic. Because of its literary character it may be an epimythion of a parable. But it also resembles the *Kephalaia* of the Berlin type, although one cannot identify it with one of them.[72] Mani enjoins that the layman shall divide his day into three parts (So. *myδδ pr ïïï pty'p βxšy*). The first part of the day is devoted to service for the government and the superiors, the second to earn one's living. Since the text is unfortunately fragmentary, the third part is missing. Nevertheless, one can suppose that it was reserved for the religious tasks of the Hearer, especially for the provision of the Elect with alms.[73]

> To divide the day into three parts. And again the Apostle, the Lord Mār Mānī spoke thus: The wise and soul-loving person (= the Hearer) should divide the day into three parts. The first (part should be devoted) to the service of kings and lords so that they do not start quarrelling and scheming. The second to the pursuit of worldly affairs, to tilling and sowing, to allotments and inheritances, to buying and selling, so that the house be

[70] Cf. *PsBk* 222.1–2: "a table was set in [the house for] souls that they might not wander" (Allberry 1938, 222), a description of the "Table of God" of the Elect. It remains unclear who is meant by the "Living" – the Elect or the particles of the Living Soul which find redemption during this meal?

[71] Allberry 1938, 222.

[72] So already Henning 1945b, 266. Cf. Sundermann 1992b.

[73] Henning 1945b, 470 n. 7.

> maintained, that wife and children be not in distress, and that kinsmen, friends, and well-wishers can be well served. (M135,39–63, Sogdian)[74]

Thus, we find a three-part division also of the day besides that of the night mentioned in Manichaean texts. This proves that there existed special regulations for a time-management, although it does not appear in the extant canonical scriptures. According to the *Fihrist*, Mani also wrote a book called "Ordinances of the Hearers/Ordinances of the Elect," otherwise mentioned as "The secret law which Mani brought and the ordinances which he ordained."[75] It does not seem to be identical with Mani's lost work Pragmateia, only known by its title and some vague indications about its content in Chinese and Arabic sources. This book appears to have been a treatise on cosmogonical and eschatological problems, recently identified by Sundermann with the *Ārdhang*, which was formerly supposed as being Mani's "Picture-Book."[76] Following Augustine, the "Rule of Life" (*vivendi regula*) with instructions on the "three seals" or the five rules for the Elect was part of Mani's Epistle (*epistula fundamenti*).[77] It may have also contained the regulations of the times and the manner of prayers and fasts, but probably no explanations for the practical management of the whole day, especially that of the laity.

The question arises whether there are possible parallels in other religious texts that could have influenced a Manichaean division of the course of the day. It is very likely that the Manichaeans as a religious minority tried to avoid any difficulties with the authorities of the regions where their mission took place. Possibly, they adopted already existing conventions of a religion of those regions. Besides Buddhism, Christianity, and Gnostic teachings, Zoroastrianism also can be taken into account as a source of patterns the Manichaeans may have used to organize the course of the laity's day. It is not surprising that we can find, in fact, parallels in the Zoroastrian literature. The MP. wisdom-text *Čīdag handarz ī pōryōtkēšān*, "Selected advice of the teachers of the primeval religion," also named *Pandnāmag ī Zardušt*, "Book of advice

---

[74] Henning 1945b, 469–470, text B, ll. 39–63.

[75] *Fihrist* 333, 336 (Flügel 1862, 64, 72, 95, 103; Dodge 1970, II 788, 798).

[76] The Greek title πραγματεία can be recognized (through Syriac transmission) in Arab. *faraqmātiya* of the *Fihrist* 336 (Flügel 1862, 73, 103; Dodge 1970, II 798) and Chin. *bojiamadiya* in the *Compendium* (Haloun/Henning 1952, 195, 207). For the *Pragmateia* see Schmidt/Polotsky 1933, 38; Schaeder 1933, 347; Tardieu 1981, 55–57; Sundermann 2005, 381–383.

[77] Augustine, *de moribus Manichaeorum* 20.74 (Rutzenhöfer 2004, 240–241).

of Zardušt," gives instructions in religious duties to be fulfilled by the male Zoroastrian, and lists marriage, reproduction, agriculture, cattle breeding, and of course an active practicing of the religion among them. The text recommends that the believer shall divide his day and his night into three parts (MP. *sē ēk ī rōz ud sē ēk ī šab*), so that he may devote himself one third each of both to religion, one third to agriculture, and one third to recovery.[78]

> Fifthly, (one is) to go to a theological seminar and to inquire of the wisdom of the pious during one-third of the day and one-third of the night; (one is) to do tillage and fertilization (of the land) one third of the day and one-third of the night; (one is) to eat, to rejoice and to repose one-third of the day and one third of the night. (ČHPk 8, Middle Persian)[79]

Apart from *handarz* texts with more popular character, there are others based on material that is very ancient and refers to orthodox tradition, since already the Avesta contained passages of gnomic features.[80] For the *handarz* passage quoted here we find a corresponding reference in the *Vidēvdād*, of which the MP. version is more extended than the Avestan and contains several commentaries. Both give a slightly differing division of day and night into two thirds for chanting and praying to increase wisdom (MP. *pēš-iz nēmag rōz ud pas-iz ud pēš-iz nēmag šab ud pas-iz*; Av. *ˣpauruuaiiaca naēmeˣasniˣaparaiica ˣpauruuaiiaca naēmeˣxšafniˣaparaiiaca*) and one third for resting (MP. *pad mayān rōzān ud šabān*; Av. *maiδiiāi asnąmca xšafnąmca auuaŋhabdaēta paitiˣasni paitiˣxšafni*). This results in a two-part division of tasks between religious education and repose, but in an effective three-part division of the course of day and night.

> And the first part of the day and the last, and the first part of the night and the last, (when his) wisdom (may) shine, – (that is, he may have made by heart), (and he may be) awakened by holiness, (that is, he may have learnt what is evident from it), he shall establish in union, (that is, utilize for the work and benefit of God), (the) illumined wisdom (that he may have made by heart, [with devotion {to God} with obeisance] to God), he shall sleep during the middle of the days and the nights, by day and

[78] There are also Zoroastrian texts, like *Handarz ī Ādurbād ī Mahraspandān*, "Advice of Ādurbād, son of Mahraspand" (Jamasp-Asana 1897, 58–71; Tarapore 1933, S. 21–33), which propose another division of tasks and activities, for example between the various days of the month.

[79] Jamasp-Asana 1897, 41–50; Kanga 1960, 21.

[80] This is true for book VI and partly for book VII and IX of the *Dēnkard* which may have been translated from lost texts of the Avesta. Cf. Shaked 1979, XVII; de Menasce 1958, 38–39.

> by night, ever from that till when they might recite those chants which the former hērbeds recited (Ādarbād son of Māraspand). (Vd. 4.45, Middle Persian)[81]

> …during the first part of the day and the last, during the first part of the night and the last, that his mind may be increased in intelligence and wax strong in holiness. So shall he sit up, in devotion and prayers, that he may be increased in intelligence: he shall rest during the middle part of the day, during the middle part of the night, and thus shall he continue until he can say all the words which former Aēθrapatis have said. (Vd.4.45[123–127], Avestan)[82]

This means that the Zoroastrian should sleep only the third part of the day and the third part of the night.[83] For the remaining two-thirds of the day and of the night, the *Vidēvdād* intends exclusively religious activities. But it appears quite conceivable that the three-part division of the day in the *handarz* text has developed from a more popular interpretation of the *Vidēvdād* reference (especially of its Pahlavi version), because it helped the Zoroastrian believers to manage their tasks and to divide their time properly. The Pahlavi translation of the *Vidēvdād* was probably written down between the 4th and 6th c., other Pahlavi versions like that of the *Yasna* were compiled from older translations in the 8/9th c.[84]

The division of the course of the day in Zoroastrianism is based on ritual actions which had to be carried out at the proper times of the day. Y.44.5 calls Ahura Mazdā the creator of the three times of the day: dawn, noon, and nightfall (Av. *uṣ̌ā arəm.piθβā xṣ̌apācā*). The "responsible person" (Av. *cazdōŋghuuaṇt-*) "seems to refer to the priest and the truthful lord of the house, who dutifully have to perform the daily rites."[85] So we can find an original three-part division of the day already in the *Gāθās* with parallels in the *Veda*.

> This I ask Thee, tell me plainly, O Ahura: Which artist created both, light and darkness? Which artist assigned both, sleep and waking (to their proper time)? Who (is He) through whom dawn, noon, and night-

---

[81] Jamasp 1907, 130; Anklesaria 1949, 87–88.
[82] Jamasp 1907, 129; Darmesteter 1995, 46.
[83] This is supported by Y. 62.4–5: "Give me, O Fire, Ahura Mazda's son…an offspring sure of foot, that never sleeps on watch [not for a third part of the day, or night], and that rises quick from bed…" (Darmesteter 1895, 46 n. 1).
[84] Cantera 2004, 235–236.
[85] Humbach 1991, II, 150, n. 3, 4, 6.

fall (exist) which remind a responsible (person) of (his dutiful) purpose? (Y.44.5, Avestan)[86]

The number "three" is frequently used in the Zoroastrian ritual context. The text *Nērangestān*, which refers to priests, mentions for example the three time repetition of ritual formulas, the three time measurement of liquid sacrifices, and three strikes of a whip as a punishment.[87] Chapters 1–4 of the *Hērbedestān* discuss the problem of time-division between religious studies and taking care of possessions.[88] It is very important that a caretaker (MP. *sālār*) of the property should be appointed who is responsible for it during the religious studies of the owner (Hērb. 1.4, 2.4). If the owner goes forth to follow his studies, the text fixes a distance of 30 frasang or three nights (Av. *θrixšaparəm*) from the property (Hērb. 2.6, 4.4). In another place it is said that the priest may go so far to pursue his religious studies that he should be able to visit his possessions three times in a year (Av. *yaṭ hiš θriš yārə aētahmāṭ *aiβišūiti*, Hērb. 4.2). These references confirm a division between religious and secular duties in Zoroastrianism based on a three-part division of time.

But there are also diverging instructions for time-managment in Sasanian Iran. According to the *Āyīn l'-Ardašīr*, king Ardašīr divided the day into four periods.[89] The first one at dawn should be devoted to prayers and ruminating, the second until noon should be used fulfilling obligations and following one's business (noontime was reserved for the first meal of the day and for reposing), the third until nightfall should be spent with family affairs, and the fourth after nightfall should be filled with eating, drinking, celebrating, enjoying oneself and relaxing. Although the *Āyīn* deals with a four-part division, it clearly reflects the ancient Zoroastrian vertices of time-reckoning: dawn, noon, and nightfall. The text describes, of necessity, such occupations in detail which are typical for the king and the nobility and reflects their point of view.

The Manichaeans had obviously a good knowledge of Zoroastrian teachings and worship as it becomes clear from several pieces of evidence in the Manichaean sources.[90] Mani's book *Šābuhragān* and other

[86] Humbach 1991, I, 158.
[87] See glossary of the *Nērangestān* (Kotwal/Kreyenbroek 2003, 288).
[88] Kotwal/Kreyenbroek 1992, 28–39; Humbach/Elfenbein 1990, 20–39.
[89] For the following see Grignaschi 1966, 103–128.
[90] Cf. the Pa. hymns to the Living Soul: M7, M496a, M1963 (Andreas/Henning 1934, 869–875, text g; Klimkeit 1989, 79–82) and M95, M564, M1876, M1877

works of Manichaean Iranian literature show features of a terminological adaptation to Zoroastrianism.[91] Therefore, Mani and his followers must have known the main religious scriptures of Zoroastrianism, and the Sogdian text M135 may depend on such more popular interpretations of them as we find in the *Čīdag handarz ī pōryōtkēšān*. Mani possibly knew the Zoroastrian regulation of time-management based on a three-part division when he started his mission in Sasanian Iran, as did the Manichaeans who lived in neighborhood with the Zoroastrian Sogdian population in Transoxania until the invasion of Islam in the 8th c. Henning remarks that M135 is still in good Sogdian, therefore it must have been written when Sogdian was still an active language, and when the majority of the Manichaean Hearers were Sogdians.[92] This seems to fit especially the period of the *Dīnāwarīya* community beginning with its first archegos Šād-Ohrmezd (died 600 CE);[93] but Transoxania continued to be a center of Manichaean activities until the 10th c., with the seat of the Manichaean bishop in Samarkand.[94] If M135 is not translated from an older MP. or Pa. text, and if the ascription of the precept in it to Mani is non-historical, it could be compared with other texts, for example (MP.) M2/I/ about a missionary journey of Mār Ammō into the Northwest of the Sasanian empire, in which the origin of the *Dīnāwarīya* is dated back into the early period of Manichaeism.[95] M135 may have been written especially for Sogdian Hearers who lived in the Zoroastrian environment of Central Asia. Klimkeit assumes that the Turkish confession book *Xwāstwānīft* and similar texts have been written down first in Sogdian.[96] This speaks for the great importance of the Manichaean laymanship in Sogdiana.

A division of the day into three parts may have been still in use among the Manichaean laymen within the Uyghur Steppe Empire (762–840 CE), where the king with his family and the nobility

---

(Andreas/Henning 1933, 318–321; Klimkeit 1989, 85–87). M95 contains a detailed description of the sacrifice rite. The Pa. *Gyān wifrās* mentions the Av. *Ahunauuaitî Gāθās* (Y. 28–34), see M838/r/9 = M419+M3824/r/3: *'whmwyt g'ẖ* (Sundermann 1997b, 60, 76f., 114 n. 2, § 32). For a possible influence of Zoroastrianism on the Manichaean religion see Sundermann 1997a.

[91] Colditz 2005, and 2006.

[92] Henning 1945b, 465.

[93] On the *Dīnāwarīya*-community, see Sundermann 1996, 418–419; Henning 1936b, 17; Colditz 1992, 324–328.

[94] *Fihrist* 336 (Flügel 1862, 77, 106; Dodge 1970, II, 802).

[95] Sundermann 1986, 271–273.

[96] Klimkeit 1989, 22.

belonged to them, and even in the subsequent Uyghur kingdom of Qočo (850–1250 CE). Sogdian clerics had there the particular function of teachers at the court.[97] The official introduction of Manichaeism caused a re-evaluation of secular life and raised the status of laity.[98] Generous almsgiving increased the possessions of the monasteries, which had estates, vineyards and servants at their disposal. The Turkish *Xwāstwānīft* gives an impression of the obligations of the Hearers that arose from this. Otherwise, it does not mention a division of the course of the day after the pattern of M135. It distinguishes instead between the spiritual and the secular power as between "inside" and "outside."[99] The Turkish *Monastery Scroll* mentions people of various professions serving the monastery, such as a miller, wood-cutters, cooks, and physicians. Serving improperly led to draconian punishment by strokes or imprisonment.[100]

Conclusion

One cannot exclude the possibility that also conventions of other religions may have influenced the division of the day for the Manichaean Hearers into three parts.[101] However, it is not the time and place here to discuss this problem sufficiently. The parallels between the Manichaean instructions and the Zoroastrian ones are nevertheless striking enough to conclude a connection between both sets of precepts. However, in modern Zoroastrianism we do not find a time-management based on a three-part division.[102] The course of the day is divided there into five parts of different length (*gāh*), two of them belonging to the night and three to the day, and every part is connected with a special prayer: the first (*Hawān* < Av. *hāuuani-*) from sunrise to noon, the second (*Rafatwen* < Av. *rapiθβina-*) from noon to mid-afternoon (aprox. 3 p.m.), the

[97] Asmussen 1965, 147–148.
[98] Klimkeit 1989, 28–29, 53; Klimkeit 1982, 27–30.
[99] Klimkeit 1989, 34.
[100] Klimkeit 1993, 352–353. Text of the scroll ed. Zieme 1975.
[101] Ch. Reck kindly draw my attention to a Sogdian homily which gives instructions on solitary life to handle conflicts emerging from it. This is due to some Syriac Christian authors ('Abdišo', Isaac, John the Solitary, Philoxenus) who describe the hermit's life in three consecutive periods, called "corporeal," "psychical," and "spiritual." For the Sogdian text and its Syriac patterns see Sims-Williams 1985a, 69–77. But this differs fundamentally from the instructions of M135.
[102] For the following see Stausberg 2005, III, 59–63, 579.

third (*Uziran* < Av. *uzaiieirina-*) from mid-afternoon to sunset, the forth (*Aiwaẑritrem* < Av. *aiβisrūθrima-*) from sunset to midnight and the fifth (*Ušahen* < Av. *ušahina-*) from midnight to dawn. This shows a modification of ritual prescriptions into a five-part division which is already proofed in the *Younger Avesta*, and may be originally an adaptation to the five *Gāθās*.[103] The five Muslim prayers have possibly further influenced this practice (or, on the contrary, may even have been influenced by it). It is interesting that some of the religious texts from the early Islamic period still appear to support the emphasis on religious activities during the day.[104] Considering his own doctrine as the perfect completion of all previous religions, Mani possibly directed his attention to the basic scriptures of the preceding apostles. For Zoroastrianism these were the *Gāθās* which may have appeared to Mani as being closer to the "true" teachings of Zarathustra than the other Zoroastrian texts. Such a critical attitude can certainly be presupposed also among later Manichaeans. For that reason they adapted a three-part division of the day as a measure of time-management, since it is already attested in Y.44 and taken up again in the *Vidēvdād* and in the MP. *handarz*-literature. Nevertheless, the Manichaean Hearers made the nighttime the focus of their religious obligations, in the center of which stood their vigils.[105] That period required the greatest efforts in the fight against the dark powers for the redemption of the Light.

---

[103] Humbach 1991, I, 68, § 11.2.1.

[104] *Dēnkard* 449.18–19 (Amouzgar/Tafazzoli 2000, 60–61) mentions the three daily prayers at dawn, noon and sunset (MP. *se bār andar rōz pad hu-waxš ud nēm-rōz ud hu-fašmō-dād*). *Šāyist-nē-šāyist* 9.8 (Tavadia 1930, 118) forbids eating (as part of certain ritual activities?) during the night (MP. *pad tārīgīh xwarišn nē pādixšāy xwardan*). Whoever does so, the demons and the Druz rob one third of his knowledge and glory (*čē ka pad tārīgīh xwarišn xwarēd, ā-š dēw ud druz xrad ud xwarrah sē ēk ēw bē apparēd*). The text takes recourse to instructions of Ohrmazd to Zarathustra (but here two thirds of the "innate wisdom" get robbed). See Stausberg 2005, III, 60, 63.

[105] Cf. Augustine, *de moribus Manichaeorum* 70: *Et hoc factum est ea nocte qua festae apud vos vigiliae celebrantur* (Rutzenhöfer 2004, 234–235).

Bibliography

ʿAfifi, R.
1963 *Ardā-virāf-nāme* (Mašhad).
Allberry, C. R. C.
1938 *A Manichaean Psalm-Book, Part II*, Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection 2 (Stuttgart).
Amouzgar, J. and A. Tafazzoli
2000 *Le cinqième livre du Dēnkard*, Studia Iranica, Cahier 23 (Paris).
Andreas, F. C. and W. B. Henning
1933 Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, II, *SPAW*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 292–363.
1934 Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, III, *SPAW*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 846–912.
Anklesaria, B. T.
1949 *Pahlavi Vendidad (Zand-i Jvit-dev-dat)* (Bombay).
Asmussen, J. P.
1965 *Xᵛāstvānīft. Studies in Manichaeism* (Copenhagen).
1975 *Manichaean Literature* (New York).
Bang, W. and A. von Gabain
1930 Türkische Turfantexte II: Manichaica, *SPAW*, Phil.- hist. Kl., 183–211.
Bartholomae, Ch.
1920 Zum sasanidischen Recht III, *SHAW* 1920.
de Blois, F.
2000 The Manichaean Daily Prayers, *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997, Berlin, 49–54*, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Berichte und Abhandlungen 4, R. E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, P. Zieme, eds. (Berlin).
Böhlig, A.
1980 *Der Manichäismus*, Die Bibliothek der Alten Welt, Reihe Antike und Christentum: Die Gnosis 3 (Zürich-München).
Cantera-Glera, A.
2004 *Studien zur Pahlavi-Übersetzung des Avesta*, Iranica 7 (Wiesbaden).
Chavannes, E. and P. Pelliot
1911 Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine, *JA*, 499–617.
Colditz, I.
1987 Bruchstücke manichäisch-parthischer Parabelsammlungen, *AoF* 14/2: 274–313.
1992 Hymnen an Šād-Ohrmezd. Ein Beitrag zur frühen Geschichte der Dīnāwarīya in Transoxanien, *AoF* 19/2: 322–341.
1995 '…werdet mit den Schriften vertraut'. Schriftgelehrtheit, Mehrsprachigkeit und Bildungsvermittlung in manichäischen Gemeinden, *Iran und Turfan*, Iranica 2, Ch. Reck, P. Zieme, eds. (Wiesbaden), 35–57.
1998 Notes on the problem of punishment and conversion in Manichaeism, *Proceedings of the Third European Conference of Iranian Studies. Part 1*, Beiträge zur Iranistik 17, N. Sims-Williams, ed. (Wiesbaden), 27–37.
2000 *Zur Sozialterminologie der iranischen Manichäer. Eine semantische Analyse im Vergleich zu den nichtmanichäischen iranischen Quellen*, Iranica 5 (Wiesbaden).
2005 Zur Adaption zoroastrischer Terminologie in Manis Šābuhragān, *Languages of Iran: Past & Present. Iranian Studies in memoriam David Neil MacKenzie*, Iranica 8, D. Weber, ed. (Wiesbaden), 17–26.
2006 On the Zoroastrian terminology in Mani's Šābuhragān. Additional notes, *Proceedings of the 5th European Conference of Iranian Studies, Ravenna 6.–11.10.2003*. A. Panaino, A. Piras, eds. (Milan), 177–182.

Darmesteter, J.
1895 *The Zend-Avesta. Part 1: The Vendîdâd*, SBE 4 (Oxford).
Dodge, B.
1970 *The Fihrist of an-Nadīm*, I–II, (New York-London).
Durkin-Meisterernst, D.
2004 *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, CFM. Dictionary of Manichaean Texts II: Texts from Central Asia and China (Turnhout).
Flügel, G.
1862 *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften* (Leipzig).
1871/2 *Kitāb al-Fihrist. I, Text*, J. Roediger, ed.; *II, Anmerkungen und Indices*, A. Mueller, ed. (Leipzig).
Grignaschi, M.
1966 Quelques spécimens de la littérature sassanide, *JA* 254: 1–142.
Haloun, G. and W. B. Henning
1953 The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light, *Asia Major* n.s. 3: 184–212.
Hansen, O.
1930 Zur soghdischen Inschrift auf dem dreisprachigen Denkmal vor Karabalgasun, *JSFO* 44/3: 1–39.
Haug, M. and E. W. West
1872 *The Book of Arda Viraf* (Bombay-London).
Henning, W. B.
1935 Arabisch ḫarāǧ, *Orientalia* 4: 291–293.
1936a *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*, APAW 10 (Berlin).
1936b Neue Materialien zur Geschichte des Manichäismus, *ZDMG* 90: 1–18.
1940 *Sogdica*, James G. Forlong Fund 21 (London).
1943 The Book of the Giants, *BSOAS* 11/1: 52–74.
1945a The Manichaean Fasts, *JRAS*: 146–164.
1945b Sogdian Tales, *BSOAS* 11/3: 465–487.
1958 Mitteliranisch, *HdO*, 1. Abt.: *Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten*. Bd. IV: *Iranistik*. Abschn. 1: *Linguistik*, B. Spuler, ed. (Leiden), 20–130.
Humbach, H.
1991 *The Gathas of Zarathushtra*, 2 Bde, Indogermanische Bibliothek, Reihe 1 (Heidelberg).
Humbach, H. and J. Elfenbein
1990 *Ērbedestān. An Avesta-Pahlavi Text*, Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 15, N.F. (München).
Jamasp, H.
1907 *Vendidâd*. I, The Texts; II, Glossarial Index (Bombay).
Jamasp-Asana, J. M.
1897 *Pahlavi Texts*. I–II, Iranian Culture Foundation 112 (Bombay).
Kanga, E. M. F
1960 *Čīīak handarz i Pōryōtkēšān. A Pahlavi Text* (Bombay).
Kent, R. G.
1953 *Old Persian. Grammar. Texts. Lexicon*, American Oriental Series 33 (New Haven).
Klíma, O.
1957 *Mazdak. Geschichte einer sozialen Bewegung im sassanidischen Persien* (Prag).
1962 *Manis Zeit und Leben*, Monographien des Orientinstituts der Tschechoslowakischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 18 (Prag).
Klimkeit, H.-J.
1982 Manichaean Kingship: Gnosis at Home in the World, *Numen* 39/1: 17–32.
1989 *Hymnen und Gebete der Religion des Lichts*, Abh. Rhein.-Westf. AdW, 79 (Opladen).

1993 *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic Texts from Central Asia* (San Francisco).

Klimkeit, H.-J. and H. Schmidt-Glintzer

1984 *Die türkischen Parallelen zum chinesisch-manichäischen Traktat*, Zentralasiatische Studien des Seminars für Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft Zentralasiens der Universität Bonn 17 (Wiesbaden).

Kotwal, F. M. and Ph. Kreyenbroek

1992 *The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān. Vol. I: Hērbedestān*, Studia Iranica, Cahier 10 (Paris).

2003 *The Hērbedestān and Nērangestān. Vol. III: Nērangestān, Fragard 2*, Studia Iranica, Cahier 30 (Paris).

van der Lof, L. J.

1962 Manichäische Verbeugungen vor der Sonne auf dem Vorderplatze der Sankt Peterskirche in Rom? *Numen* 16/2: 156–160.

Macuch, M.

1981 Das *sasanidische Rechtsbuch „Mātakdān i hazār dātistān" (Teil II)*, Abh. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 45/1 (Wiesbaden).

1993 *Rechtskasuistik und Gerichtspraxis zu Beginn des siebenten Jahrhunderts in Iran. Die Rechtssammlung des Farroḫmard ī Wahrāmān*, Iranica, 1 (Wiesbaden).

Madan, J. M.

1911 *The Complete Text of the Pahlavi Dinkard*, I–II (Bombay).

de Menasce, J.

1958 *Une encyclopédie mazdéenne, Le Dēnkart* (Paris).

Müller, F. W. K.

1913 *Mahrnāmag. Ein Doppelblatt aus einem manichäischen Hymnenbuch*, APAW 1912 (Berlin).

Polotsky, H. J.

1934 *Manichäische Homilien*, Manichäische Handschriften der Sammlung A. Chester Beatty, I (Stuttgart).

1935 Manichäismus, *[August Friedrich] Paulys Real-Encyklopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. Bd. 6 (Stuttgart), 240– 271 (repr. in Widengren 1977, 101–144).

Polotsky, H. J. and A. Böhlig

1940 *Kephalaia, 1. Hälfte (Lieferung 1–10)*, Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin, I (Stuttgart).

1966 *Kephalaia. 2. Hälfte (Lieferung 11/12)*, Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin, I (Stuttgart).

Radloff, W.

1895 *Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei* (St. Petersburg).

Reck, Ch.

1992 Ein weiterer parthischer Montagshymnus? *AoF* 19/2: 342–349.

1997 Some Remarks on the Monday and Bema Hymns of the German Turfan Collection, *Manichaeism and Early Christianity. Third International Congress of Manichaean Studies. Proceedings*, Manichaean Studies 3, L. Cirillo, A. Van Tongerloo, eds. (Leuven-Neapel), 297–303.

2004 *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen – Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen*, BTT 22 (Turnhout).

2006 *Mitteliranische Handschriften. Teil 1: Berliner Turfanfragmente manichäischen Inhalts*, Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland Bd. 17,1 (Stuttgart).

Reichelt, H.

1900 Der Frahang i Oīm, I, *WZKM* 14: 177–213.

1901 Der Frahang i Oīm, II, *WZKM* 15: 117–186.

Rutzenhöfer, E., ed.

2004 *Augustinus. De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum – Die Lebensführung der katholischen Kirche und die Lebensführung der Manichäer*, Augustinus,

Opera, Werke B., Antimanichäische Schriften 1; Schriften zur Lebensführung 25 (Paderborn-München-Wien-Zürich).

Sanjana, D. P.
1874–1928 *The Dinkard*, I–XIX (Bombay).

Schaeder, H. H.
1933 Rezension von Schmidt und Polotsky, Ein Mani-Fund, *Gnomon* 9: 337–362.

Schlegel, G.
1896 *Die chinesische Inschrift auf dem uigurischen Denkmal von Kara Balgassun*, Mémoirs de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 9 (Helsingfors).

Schmidt, C. and H. J. Polotsky
1933 Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten. Originalschriften des Mani und seiner Schüler *SPAW*: 2–90.

Schmidt-Glintzer, H.
1987 *Chinesische Manichaica*, Studies in Oriental Religions 14 (Wiesbaden).

Shaked, Sh.
1979 *The Wisdom of the Sasanian Sage*, Persian Heritage Series 34 (Boulder).

Sims-Williams, N.
1985a *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C2*, BTT 12 (Berlin).
1985b The Manichean Commandments: A Survey of the Sources, *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*, Acta Iranica 25, Hommages et Opera Minora 11 (Leiden), II, 573–582.

Stausberg, M.
2005 *Die Religion Zarathustras. Geschichte-Gegenwart-Rituale*, 1–3 (Stuttgart).

Sundermann, W.
1973 *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer*, BTT 4 (Berlin).
1975 Überreste Manichäischer Yimki-Homilien in mittelpersischer Sprache? *Monumentum H.S. Nyberg*, Acta Iranica 5 (Téhéran-Liège), II, 397–312.
1976 Commendatio pauperum. Eine Angabe der sassanidischen politisch-didaktischen Literatur zur gesellschaftlichen Struktur Irans, *AoF* 4: 167–194.
1977 Parthisch 'bšwdg'n 'die Täufer', *AAH* 25: 237–242.
1981 *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*, BTT 11 (Berlin).
1984a Die Prosaliteratur der iranischen Manichäer, *OrLovAn* 16: 227–241.
1984b *Studien zu Geschichte und Wert historiographischer Traditionen der Manichäer unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der iranischen Überlieferung*, Dissertation B, Berlin.
1985 *Ein manichäisch-soghdisches Parabelbuch*, BTT 15 (Berlin).
1986 Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer, II, *AoF* 13/2: 241–319.
1990 Bēma, *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (London-New York), Vol. 4, 136–137.
1992a Iranian Manichaean Turfan Texts Concerning the Turfan Region, *Turfan and Tun-Huang. The Texts*, A. Cadonna, ed. (Florenz), 63–84.
1992b Iranische Kephalaiatexte? *Studia Manichaica II*, G. Wiessner, H.-J. Klimkeit, ed. (Wiesbaden), 305–318.
1992c *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous*, BTT 17 (Berlin).
1996 Dīnāvarīya, *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (Costa Mesa), Vol. 7, 418–419.
1997a How Zoroastrian is Mani's Dualism? *Manichaeism and Early Christianity. Third International Congress of Manichaean Studies. Proceedings*, Manichaean Studies 3, L. Cirillo, A. Van Tongerloo, eds. (Leuven-Naples), 343–360.

1997b *Der Sermon von der Seele. Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus*, BTT 19 (Berlin).
1997c Ein weiterer manichäischer Beichttext aus Turfan, *AoF* 24: 259–267.
2005 Was the *Ārdhang* Mani's Picture-Book? *New Perspectives in Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Manichaean Studies, Neaples September 2001*, Manichaean Studies 5, L. Cirillo, A. Van Tongerloo, eds. (Turnhout), 381–383.

Tarapore, J. C.
1933 *Pahlavi Andarz-Nāmak* (Bombay).

Tardieu, M.
1981 *Le Manichéisme*, Que sais-je 1940 (Paris).

Tavadia, J. C.
1930 *Šāyast nē-šāyast*, Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 3 (Hamburg).

Tsui Chi and W. B. Henning
1943 Mo Ni Chiao Hsia Pu Tsan, The Lower (Second?) Section of the Manichaean Hymns, *BSOAS* 11: 174–219.

Vermes, M.
2001 *Acta Archelai*, Manichaean Studies 4 (Leuven).

Waldschmidt, E. and W. Lentz
1926 *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*, APAW, Phil.-hist.Kl. 4 (Berlin).

Widengren, G., ed.
1977 *Der Manichäismus*, Wege der Forschung 168 (Darmstadt).

Williams, A. V., ed.
1990 *The Pahlavi Rivāyat accompanying the Dādestān ī Dēnīg, Part 2*, Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser 60 (Copenhagen).

Wurst, G.
1995 *Das Bemafest der ägyptischen Manichäer*, Arbeiten zum spätantiken und koptischen Ägypten 8 (Altenberge)
1996 *Die Bema-Psalmen*, CFM Ser. Copt. I. Liber Psalmorum II/1 (Turnhout).

Zieme, P.
1975 Ein uigurischer Text über die Wirtschaft manichäischer Klöster im uigurischen Reich, *Researches in Altaic Languages*, L. Ligeti, ed. (Budapest), 331–338.

CHARACTERISTICS OF MANICHAEISM IN ROMAN AFRICA

J. Kevin Coyle
Ottawa

In the summer of 2003 I made a presentation on characteristics of Christianity in Roman North Africa.[1] I was working from the premise that this region put its own stamp on every religious expression it imported, an idea I apply here to the case of Manichaeism. By "Roman Africa" I mean the administrative expanse from roughly Tunisia's present border with Libya to the Atlantic, and from the southern shore of the Mediterranean to the Sahara. I have chosen not to follow the lead of François Decret or Richard Lim, who included Rome when considering what might have been different about Manichaeism in Roman Africa. Even if, as Lim remarks, "the two historically formed a very tight *Kulturwelt*,"[2] I think that the possibility of a "cultural tightness" would have to be nuanced in many ways. Still, the important article Lim published in 1989 argues a good case against "the prevalent notion among scholars that Manichaeism anywhere remains essentially the same, even where significant local variations are not denied." Lim adds that

> the process itself virtually guarantees that its results will be consonant with the beginning assumption. That is to say, a consistent and coherent

[1] J. K. Coyle, "Particularities of Christianity in Roman Africa," *Studia Patristica 39: Papers presented at the Fourteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 2003*, F. Young, M. Edward, and P. Parvis, eds. (Leuven – Paris – Dudley, 2006), 13–26. This builds on my previous work: "The Self-Identity of North African Christians in Augustine's Time," *Augustinus Afer. Saint Augustin: africanité et universalité. Actes du colloque international, Alger-Annaba, 1–7 avril 2001*, Paradosis, 45/1, P.-Y. Fux, J.-M. Roessli, and O. Wermelinger, eds. (Fribourg, 2003), 61–73.

[2] R. Lim, "Unity and Diversity among Western Manichaeans: A Reconsideration of Mani's 'sancta ecclesia'," *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 35 (1989): 232 n. 4. See F. Decret, "Le manichéisme présentait-il en Afrique et à Rome des particularismes régionaux distinctifs?," *Augustinianum* 34 (1994): 5–40; repr. in *idem*, *Essais sur l'Église manichéenne en Afrique du Nord et à Rome au temps de saint Augustin: Recueil d'études*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 47 (Rome, 1995), 209–40.

> social entity called "Manichaeism", together with its attendant systems of ideas, emerges with comforting predictability.[3]

I will try to avoid the comfort zone by moving in a different direction, from the identification of some differences peculiar to North African Manichaeism to the question of how deep their roots might have reached. This article, then, expands on the work of Decret, the undisputed expert on Manichaeism in North Africa.[4] Decret rejected the notion of a completely autonomous brand of Manichaeism for North Africa,[5] while admitting that in certain respects it had its own style.[6] He took Lodewijk Grondijs to task for speaking of "sectes manichéennes, toutes différentes, dans lesquelles un nombre de points originaux se sont graduellement melangés aux mythes, croyances et systèmes" of the societies wherein Manichaeism was implanted;[7] but he did concede that to some degree Manichaeism, wherever it was, would have reflected the ambient culture.[8] Even this cautious assertion of elements distinctive to Manichaeism in North Africa, and of the influence of local cultures in shaping those elements,[9] was too much for Michel Tardieu, who thought that the cultural element is often so nebulous as to defy easy identification.[10] But I think that Decret's stand has some merit, though not necessarily for the same reasons.

---

[3] Lim, "Unity," 231–32.

[4] See F. Decret, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine: Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Felix avec saint Augustin* (Paris, 1970); *idem*, *L'Afrique manichéenne (IV^e–V^e siècles): Étude historique et doctrinale*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1978); along with a host of articles, some of which are indicated in the following notes.

[5] F. Decret, "Introduzione generale" *Sant'Agostino, Polemica con i Manichei*, Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana 13/1 (Rome, 1997), xv: "il manicheismo che Agostino ha conosciuto in Africa non è un sistema deformata dal cristianesimo della *Catholica* che lo circonda, ma proprio quello che Mani stesso aveva predicata."

[6] F. Decret, "La doctrine centrale du *spiritalis salvator* dans les sources manichéennes africaines," *Studia Manichaica: IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, 14.–18. Juli 1997*, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berichte und Abhandlungen, Sonderband 4, R. E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, and P. Zieme, eds. (Berlin, 2000), 138–39.

[7] H. L. Grondijs, "Analyse du manichéisme numidien au IV^e siècle" *Augustinus Magister: Congrès international augustinien, Paris, 21–24 septembre 1954* (Paris, 1954), vol. 3, 392; quoted by Decret, "Le manichéisme présentait-il," 6 (= *Essais*, 209).

[8] Decret, "Le manichéisme présentait-il," 7 (= *Essais*, 210): "une étude de la doctrine manichéenne, comme de tout autre système religieux, ne saurait négliger les mentalités et le patrimoine culturel des populations au sein desquelles cette doctrine s'est propagée et dont peu ou prou elle porte l'empreinte."

[9] E.g., Decret, *L'Afrique manichéenne* I, 191–92, 205–10, 270–73, 300, and 305–12.

[10] M. Tardieu, "Vues nouvelles sur le manichéisme africain?," *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 25 (1979): 249–55, esp. 250–51. Decret's response is in "Encore le manichéisme," *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 26 (1980): 306–12, esp. 308–09.

Manichaeism in Africa

Decret described Roman Africa as the region of the ancient world wherein "le manichéisme a sans doute développé sa plus vaste action de propagande," where "la religion de Mani fit preuve apparamment de sa plus grande vitalité."[11] But if the Manichaeism of Africa was a lively movement, its strength and size are unclear. Geographically, we can only place it in Thagaste (modern Souk Ahras), Milevis (Mila), and Hippo Regius (Annaba) – all in Numidia (present-day eastern Algeria) – as well as in one location in Africa Proconsularis (Carthage) and two in Mauretania Caesariensis (Tipasa and Malliana). These possibly represent the full geographical extent of the Manichaean phenomenon in Roman Africa.[12] As for vitality, on a literary level that phenomenon has left us with but two direct (emic) primary sources: the fragmentary manuscript of Tebessa[13] and Faustus of Milevis' *Capitula de christiana fide et ueritate*.[14] Other than these, Augustine of Hippo, on whom we depend

[11] F. Decret, "L'utilisation des épîtres de Paul chez les manichéens d'Afrique," *Le Epistole Paoline nei Manichee, i Donatisti e il primo Agostino*, Sussidi Patristici 5, J. Ries *et al.*, eds. (Rome, 1989), 41 (= *Essais*, 67).

[12] For the indications see S. N. C. Lieu, "Sources on the Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire (From Diocletian to Justinian)," *A Green Leaf: Papers in Honour of Jes P. Asmussen*, Acta Iranica 28 = Series 2, XII (Leiden, 1988), 390–91; and Decret, *L'Afrique manichéenne* I, 191–203 (notes in II, 136–49).

[13] Text in PLS 2, 1378–88. See P. Alfaric, "Un manuscrit manichéen," *Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses* n.s. 6 (1920): 62–98; R. Merkelbach, "Der manchäische Codex von Tebessa," *Manichaean Studies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism, August 5–9, 1987, Department of History of Religions, Lund University, Sweden*, Lund Studies in African and Asian Religions 1, P. Bryder, ed. (Lund, 1988), 229–64; F. Decret, "Aspects de l'Église Manichéenne – Remarques sur le manuscrit de Tebessa" *Signum Pietatis: Festgabe für Cornelius Petrus Mayer OSA zum 60. Geburtstag*, Cassiciacum 40, A. Zumkeller, ed. (Würzburg, 1989), 123–51; J. BeDuhn and G. Harrison, "The Tebessa Codex: A Manichaean Treatise on Biblical Exegesis and Church Order," *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 43, P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn, eds. (Leiden, 1997), 33–87; and M. Stein, "Bemerkungen zum Kodex von Tebessa," *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West: Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht International Symposium of the IAMS*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 49, J. van Oort, O. Wermelinger and G. Wurst, eds. (Leiden, 2001), 250–71. Stein thinks (258) that its original language was Latin. If so, its place of origin would probably be Africa.

[14] Text reconstructed by P. Monceaux, "Le manichéen Faustus de Milev: Restitution de ses Capitula," *Mémoires de l'Institut National de France, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 43/1 (1933): 1–111. On Faustus' work see G. Wurst, "Bemerkungen zu Struktur und *genus litterarium* der *Capitula* des Faustus von Mileve," *Augustine and Manichaeism*, van Oort *et al.*, eds., 307–24. I do not understand why Decret ("L'utilisation," 42–44 = *Essais*, 67–68) includes the work of Adimantus among Manichaean writings emanating from Africa.

even for Faustus' work, and Augustine's disciple Evodius of Uzala[15] are our only (etic) sources for details on Manichaeism in Roman Africa in the pre-Vandal period. That complicates matters, not only because of the extent to which we are forced to depend on Augustine's "take" on the movement, but also because when it comes to Manichaeans his agenda is chiefly polemical, meaning that he reports only aspects of the movement he intends to attack.[16] So, even if his accounts are accurate, they must be incomplete.

As in the case of Christianity,[17] the circumstances of Manichaeism's arrival in Roman Africa are shrouded in obscurity. The first acknowledgement of its presence appears in Diocletian's rescript to Amnius Anicianus Iulianus, governor of Africa, at the turn of the third to fourth centuries.[18] It reads:

> We have heard that the Manichaeans, concerning whom your Resourcefulness has written to our Serenity, have set up new and hitherto unheard-of sects in opposition to the older creeds so that they might cast out the doctrines vouchsafed to us in the past by divine favour for the benefit of their own depraved doctrine. They have sprung forth very recently (*nuperrime*) like new and unexpected monstrosities among the race of the Persians – a nation still hostile to us (*de Persica aduersaria nobis*) – and have made their

[15] The so-called *De fide contra Manichaeos* (CSEL 25/2, pp. 951–75), on which see F. Decret, "Le traité d'Evodius contre les manichéens: Un compendium à l'usage du parfait controversiste," *Augustinianum* 31 (1991): 387–409 (= *Essais*, 124–45).

[16] Decret, "Le manichéisme présentait-il," 8–10 (= *Essais*, 211–13).

[17] I do not discuss here Manichaeism's claim to be authentically Christian, though that claim was a patent aspect of it in the Roman West (and not just in Africa). I do think, though, that Decret's claim that "Pas une seule fois l'auteur [Augustin] ne considère la secte comme un courant extérieur au christianisme" needs some nuancing: F. Decret, "Saint Augustin, témoin du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine," *Internationales Symposion über den Stand der Augustinus-Forschung vom 12. bis 16. April 1987 im Schloß Rauischholzhausen der Justus-Liebig Universität Gießen*, Cassiciacum 39/1, C. Mayer and K.-H. Chelius, eds. (Würzburg, 1989), 88 (= *Essais*, 16). But so does the statement by Theo Sinnige that "En la forma en que se presentaba en Africa, el maniqueismo no era una superstición exótica, sino que estaba caracterizada como una secta cristiana. La investigación histórica de las última [sic] décadas ha reconocido este carácter del maniqueismo Africana": T. G. Sinnige, "El maniqueismo del joven Agustín y el relato de las Confesiones," *Jornadas Agustinianas: Con motivo del XVI centenario de la conversión de San Agustín, Madrid 22–24 de Abril de 1987* (Valladolid, 1988), 77–8.

[18] Dated by earlier scholarship on March 21, 297, the more recent consensus puts it in 302. See Decret, *L'Afrique manichéenne* I, 162–77 (notes in II, 111–24); and S. N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 63 (Tübingen, 1992 [2nd ed.]), 121–25. L. D. Bruce, "Diocletian, the Proconsul Iulianus, and the Manichaeans," *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 3, Collection Latomus 180, C. Deroux, ed. (Brussels, 1983), 336–47, holds out for 297.

> way into our empire, where they are committing many outrages, disturbing the tranquility of the people and even inflicting grave damage to the civic communities. We have come to fear that with the passage of time they will endeavour, as usually happens, to infect the modest and tranquil Roman people of an innocent nature with the damnable customs and the perverse laws of the Persians (*scaeuas leges Persarum*) as with the poison of a malignant (serpent).[19]

The first in a long string of Roman imperial indictments of the movement,[20] the rescript refers to the doctrine as newly arrived, which cannot be strictly true, for it would have had to be present long enough to catch the authorities' attention and for them to have known such details as Manichaeism's "Persian" origins. Yet that is all we hear of Manichaeans in Africa until 373, when Augustine joined them. Decret suggests that in the interim they must have made every effort to blend in with the locals:

> la grande originalité des Africains dans l'Église de Mani est d'avoir écarté, autant que possible, tout particularisme qui les ferait se singulariser parmi les populations de leur pays […]. Il est hors de doute aussi que cette «indigénisation» du manichéisme africain explique sa longue survie, malgré les persécutions qui s'étaient abbatues sur lui dès son arrivée sur ces rivages.[21]

If unsingular they were, it would indeed have been difficult to identify followers of Mani on external appearance or public behavior alone. But Decret's summation, if accurate, may refer only to Hearers. Augustine says that the Manichaean Elect never washed, and moreover were recognizable by their pale faces and bony bodies.[22] It is possible that he was referring to Manichaeans he knew in Italy, where they had enough influence to obtain a court appointment for Augustine and enough

---

[19] "De quibus sollertia tua serenitati nostrae retulit, Manichaei, audiuimus eos nuperrime ueluti noua *et* inopinata prodigia in hunc mundum de Persica aduersaria nobis gente progressa uel orta esse et multa facinora ibi committere, populos namque quietos perturbare nec non et ciuitatibus maxima detrimenta inserere: et uerendum est, ne forte, ut fieri adsolet, accedenti tempore conentur *per* execrandas consuetudines et scaeuas leges Persarum innocentioris naturae hominess, Romanam gentem modestam atque tranquillam et uniuersum orbem nostrum ueluti uenenis de suis maliuolis inficere." Text and translation in Lieu, *Manichaeism*, 121–22 (his emphasis).

[20] Listed by Lieu, "Sources," 396–98.

[21] Decret, *L'Afrique manichéenne* I, 210.

[22] Augustine, *Contra Faustum manichaeum* XX,23; *De utilitate credendi* 36.

confidence to experiment with communal living.[23] In his *Confessions* Augustine reports how his friend Alypius was initially attracted to Manichaeans because they made "a big show of their continence" (*ostentatio continentiae*) – and this attraction seems to have occurred in Carthage.[24] Besides, if ever there was a time when African Manichaeans "laid low" in Africa more than elsewhere, we have to ask why they were first spotted by Roman authorities there rather than in, say, Egypt, where Manichaeans gave every evidence of being lively and whence their movement may have entered Africa.[25]

Some demographics

Augustine says that the Hearers (or Catechumens) were numerous[26] and the Elect (or Perfect) relatively few.[27] The Hearers were mainly drawn from the farming class,[28] although William Frend, basing himself on Possidius,[29] maintains that Manichaeism was "best represented among the wealthy and comparatively secure landowners and merchants in Africa."[30] If that is so it would, again, be a case of Hearers, since the Elect were supposed to renounce all wealth and property. Of the higher orders of Elect we know of only one *episcopus* (Faustus of Milevis) for Manichaeism's entire sojourn in the region, a single *presbyter* (Fortunatus), and a lone *doctor* (Felix).[31] This is surprising if, as Decret claims, in Africa

---

[23] See Augustine, *Confessiones* V,13,23; *De moribus Manichaeorum* 20,74; and *Contra Faustum* V,5.

[24] Augustine, *Confessiones* VI,7,12.

[25] See Lieu, *Manichaeism*, 115, who takes for granted that "from Egypt the religion spread swiftly along the Mediterranean coast to Roman North Africa."

[26] Augustine, *Contra Faustum* XXX,6 (CSEL 25/1, 755.6).

[27] See – besides the references in J. K. Coyle, *Augustine's "De moribus ecclesiae catholicae": A Study of the Work, its Composition and its Sources*, Paradosis 25 (Fribourg, 1978), 424 – Augustine, *De utilitate credendi* 14,31 (CSEL 25/1, 39.7), *C. Faustum* XII,5, XX,23, and XXI,10 (382.20, 567.16–18, and 581.13,19), and *Contra Secundinum* (CSEL 25/2, 945.21–22). Unaccountably, Decret, "Introduzione generale," xciv, thinks that Hearers were separate from Catechumens, and Elect from Perfect.

[28] Augustine, *De mor. Man*. 17,62.

[29] Possidius, *Vita Augustini* 6,15–16.

[30] W. H. C. Frend, "The Gnostic-Manichaean Tradition in Roman North Africa," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 4 (1953): 18; repr. in *idem*, *Religion Popular and Unpopular in the Early Christian Centuries*, Collected Studies Series 545 (London, 1976).

[31] On all three see the pertinent articles in *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, A. Fitzgerald, ed. (Grand Rapids, 1999), and in *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* I, A. di Berardino, ed. (New York, 1992); also Decret, *L'Afrique manichéenne* I, 361–64 and 366–68.

"les communautés manichéennes [étaient] les plus importantes et les plus vivaces de toutes celles qui se développèrent en Occident."[32] None of Manichaeism's other hierarchical orders is associated with pre-Vandal Africa. On the other hand, an office seems to have been created there found nowhere else – that of the *primas*, whose function it was to oversee the catechesis of and disciplinary observance by Hearers.[33]

Internal particularities

Of the seven works usually attributed to Mani – *Shapurakan*, *Book of Giants*, *Letters*, *Pragmateia*, *Living Gospel*, *Treasury of Life*, and *Book of Mysteries* – only the last five seem to have been known in North Africa. Heptateuch had become pentateuch,[34] if we allow for the presence of some, if not all, of the letters and for the possible identification of the *Pragmateia* with the *Letter of the Foundation*. It also seems fairly clear that the appellation "foundation" for Mani's letter *quam uocant fundamenti* was an Africanism, as was its widespread popularity.[35] As to the Christian canon, if Paul was popular among Manichaeans everywhere,[36] the

---

It is not necessary to endorse Lim's explanation for the rarity ("Unity," 237) that "they might have been honorific titles." Even if they were honorary, that would not justify "the impression that 'the dropping of the senior Manichaean grades in favour of two categories only, Elect and Hearers, is an African specialty'" (Lim, *art. cit.*, 238, quoting Frend, "The Gnostic-Manichaean," 22 n. 3). Nor is there much basis for viewing the Manichaean Elect as generally more peripatetic in Africa than elsewhere (see Lim, *art. cit.*, 239). Fortunatus, for instance, lived in Hippo for years.

[32] Decret, "Le manichéisme représentait-il," 14 (= *Essais*, 217).

[33] Augustine, *De mor. Man.* 8,11 and 19,70; and *Contra Adimantum* 15,2. See Decret, "Introduzione generale," xcv. This is the same term used for a phenomenon unique to Donatists and African Catholics, the provincial episcopal primate chosen on the basis of seniority.

[34] Such is Prosper Alfaric's opinion in *Les Écritures manichéennes* II (Paris, 1919), 9, although it is questioned by Decret, *Aspects*, 105–06, who does not think there is proof of even the pentateuch in Africa. For other Manichaean works that would have been available there (i.e., in Latin) see Lieu, *Manichaeism*, 118–19.

[35] See E. Feldmann, *Die "Epistula Fundamenti" der nordafrikanischen Manichäer: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion* (Altenberge, 1987), 118.

[36] See H. D. Betz, "Paul in the Mani Biography: Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis," *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis: Atti del Simposio internazionale, Rende-Amantea, 1984*, L. Cirillo and A. Roselli, eds. (Cosenza, 1986), 215–34; E. Feldmann, "Der junge Augustinus und Paulus: Ein Beitrag zur (manichäischen) Paulus-Rezeption," *Atti del Terzo Congreso Internazionale di Studi "Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico," Arcavacanta di Rende-Amantea, 31 agosto–5 settembre 1993*, Manichaean Studies 3, L. Cirillo and A. Van Tongerloo, eds. (Turnhout, 1997), 42–48; Coyle, *Augustine's "De moribus ecclesiae catholicae,"* 187–89; and Decret, "L'utilisation," 29–48 (= *Essais*, 55–66).

accent on the writings attributed to him was more pronounced in Africa, as is attested by the Tebessa fragments and the assertions of Augustine.[37] As William Frend remarked in 1953, "Rejection of the Old Testament led in Africa to an almost exaggerated respect for the Epistles of St. Paul […]. African Manichaeism is almost a Paulinist heresy. One sees, for instance, that practically the whole of the debate between Augustine and his former friend, the Manichee Fortunatus, turns on the interpretation to be placed on Pauline texts."[38]

In terms of Christian(-sounding) doctrine, only in Latin Africa, it seems, did Manichaeans speak of the Trinity in the terms reported by Faustus and Fortunatus. In the treatise he wrote in the 380s, Faustus affirmed:

> We worship the divinity, one and the same under the threefold appellation of the Father who is God almighty, and of Christ his Son, and of the Holy Spirit. But we believe that we are to worship the Father as residing in that highest and principal light that Paul calls inaccessible [see 1 Tim 6:16]. And we believe the Son to be in the second, visible light. Because he is twofold, in that the apostle knew him as Christ and called him the power and the wisdom of God [see 1 Cor 1:24], we believe that his power resides in the sun and his wisdom in the moon. We also hold that the composition and dwelling of the Holy Spirit, who is the Third Majesty, is all the surrounding air; and that, through his effort and spiritual distribution, the earth conceives and brings forth the vulnerable Jesus (*Iesus patibilis*) who, suspended from every tree, is the life and salvation of human beings.[39]

Faustus was probably attempting to show compliance with the stipulation of the famous imperial decree in 381 that Christians profess "one Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit understood as of equal

---

[37] See Decret's exhaustive analysis in "L'utilisation," 51–83 (= *Essais*, 76–106).

[38] Frend, "The Gnostic-Manichaean Tradition," 21.

[39] In Augustine, *C. Faustum* XX,2 (CSEL 25/1, 536.9–21): Igitur nos patris quidem dei omnipotentis et Christi filii eius et spiritus sancti unum idemque sub triplici appellatione colimus numen: sed patrem quidem ipsum lucem incolere credimus summam ac principalem, quam Paulus alias inaccessibilem uocat, filium uero in hac secunda ac uisibili luce consistere. Qui quoniam sit et ipse geminus, ut eum apostolus nouit Christum dicens esse dei uirtutem et dei sapientiam, uirtutem quidem eius in sole habitare credimus, sapientiam uero in luna. Necnon et spiritus sancti, qui est maiestas tertia, aeris hunc omnem ambitum sedem fatemur et diuersorium. Cuius ex uiribus et spirituali profusione, terram quoque concipientem gignere patibilem Iesum, qui est uita ac salus hominum, omni suspensus ex lingo. My translation. See Decret, *Aspects*, 220–30; Grondijs, "Le manichéisme numidien," 398–410; and *idem*, "Numidian Manicheism in Augustinus' Time," *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 9 (1954): 38–42.

majesty and as holy Trinity,"[40] without betraying Manichaean doctrine – not unlike the tactic of the Arians the decree was targeting. Certainly the first sentence of Faustus' confession is orthodox – and probably habitual: "Haec nomina," Augustine informs us, "non recedebant de ore eorum."[41] Only in North Africa did Manichaeans so openly attempt trinitarian formulae that sounded "Catholic."[42]

That said, the rest of Faustus' profession of faith reflects no equality among the three Persons.[43] It is its soteriology that has shaped Manichaeism's cosmogony, and its cosmogony has sculpted its trinitarian view. For Faustus, Son and Spirit exist solely to speed liberated light on its way to the heavenly realm. The Father is in the highest Light,[44] while the Son is in the visible light – specifically, moon and sun, an association that makes sense when we recall Augustine's remark in *Confessions* about Jesus being projected out of the divine "luminous mass."[45] In Manichaean terms, the Son (or "Christ": not "Jesus") resides in both moon and sun, as Power in the one and Wisdom in the other (though this does not necessarily make him identical with either).[46] Eugen Rose speaks of a *Doppelwesen* or *Doppelcharakter* of the Cosmic Savior in this regard;[47] here, though, if Jesus is the issue as both suffering and redeeming, we have a case of *Doppelgestalt*. The Spirit is the "Third Majesty" (a being identified in the published Coptic *Kephalaion* 16 with the Friend

---

[40] *Codex Theodosianus*, XVI,1,2 (Feb. 27, 380), in T. Mommsen. *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus sirmondianis et leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes* I/2 (Berlin, 1905), 833: ut secundum apostolicam disciplinam euangelicamque doctrinam patris et filii et spiritus sancti unam deitatem sub parili maiestate et sub pia trinitate credamus.

[41] Augustine, *Conf.* III,6,10 (CCL 27, 31.4–5). On the effect of Manichaean trinitarian teaching on Augustine, see E. Feldmann, "Der Einfluß des Hortensius und des Manichäismus auf das Denken des jungen Augustinus von 373," Inaugural-Dissertation, Fachbereich Katholische Theologie, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster, 1975, I, 684–97 (notes in II, 308–13).

[42] On these formulae see Decret, "Introduzione generale," lxxix–lxxxii. For formulae in non-Latin Manichaeism see E. Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie* (Wiesbaden, 1979), 160–61.

[43] Decret, *Aspects*, 227: "seul le Père a droit au titre de «Dieu tout puissant», aucun attribut de divinité n'est accordé au Fils ni à l'Esprit." See I. de Beausobre, *Histoire de Manichée et du Manichéisme* I (Amsterdam, 1734), 556–68.

[44] See Decret's analysis in "L'utilisation," 73–75 (= *Essais*, 97–98).

[45] Augustine, *Conf.* V,10,20 CCL 27, 69.63–65): Ipsumque saluatorem nostrum, unigenitum tuum, tamquam de massa lucidissimae molis tuae porrectum ad nostram salutem ita putabam.

[46] *Pace* Grondijs, "Analyse," 399–400; and *idem*, "Numidian Manicheism," 40. See Decret, *Aspects*, 230.

[47] Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie*, 166.

of Lights, the Great Architect, and the Living Spirit),[48] residing in the "surrounding air," the vehicle whereby "le Père envoie sa force à la substance divine prisonnière du cosmos matériel."[49]

It is possible that African Manichaeans really did speak of worshipping the moon and sun as Christ's dwelling place, in which case Augustine's reports are correct. Though that is not quite what Faustus says, we should not forget the possibility that Manichaeism was imported to Africa from Egypt,[50] nor the African fascination with astrology.[51] Egypt may also be the inspiration for the conception of moon and sun as "light-ships."[52] In any case, what remains of Manichaean data has this expression appear only in what Augustine has transmitted.[53]

Compared with Faustus, the formula offered by the Manichaean presbyter Fortunatus in his public debate with Augustine in 392 appears innocuous in its summation (he even uses the word "trinity"): "this is the aim of our faith: in accord with the strength of our mind to obey its commandments, following the one faith of this Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."[54] Decret points out that in his trinitarian formula Fortunatus omits all mention of astral figures,[55] which could be because "le prêtre manichéen donne l'impression de vouloir mettre

---

[48] In *Kephalaia, Erste Hälfte, Lieferungen 1–10*, Manichäische Handschriften der staatlichen Museen Berlin 1, C. Schmidt, H. J. Polotsky, and H. Ibscher, eds. (Stuttgart, 1940), 49.23–25.

[49] Decret, *Aspects*, 226.

[50] See Grondijs, "Le manichéisme numidien," 399–404, who also sees inspiration in philosophical currents, such as the Stoic double logos: *endiathetos* and *prophorikos*.

[51] See F. van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop: Church and Society at the Dawn of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1961), 47 (trans. of *Augustinus de zielzorger*, Utrecht, 1949, 2nd ed.). Was astrology a passion more evident in African Manichaeism than elsewhere? If so, it might have extended, as Frend ("The Gnostic-Manichaean," 18) suggests, the "attraction felt by African Christians for the astrological cults of the East."

[52] Grondijs, "Le manichéisme numidien," 407.

[53] G. Flügel, *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Manichäismus. Aus dem Fihrist des Abûl'faradsch Muḥammed ben Isḥaḳ al-Warrâḳ* (Leipzig, 1862; repr. Osnabrück, 1969), 233, cites Abû'l faradj as the only exception to this. In Coptic *Kephalaia* 2 and 20 (Schmidt *et al.*, eds., 20.17–18 and 63.34–35) it is the Third Messenger who dwells in the sun. Feldmann, *Die "Epistula Fundamenti,"* 78, thinks that Jesus the Splendor is meant in Faustus' formula. On this see Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie*, 161–66.

[54] In Augustine, *Contra Fortunatum* 3 (CSEL 25/1, 86.10–12): haec est ratio fidei nostrae et pro uiribus animi nostri mandatis eius obtemperare unam fidem sectantes huius trinitatis, patris et filii et spiritus sancti. Transl. R. Teske, *The Manichaean Debate*, The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century I/19 (Hyde Park, 2006), 146–47. On Fortunatus' formula see W. Geerlings, "Der manichäische »Jesus patibilis« in der Theologie Augustins," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 152 (1972): 224 n. 10.

[55] Decret, *Aspects*, 233.

en évidence les aspects de sa foi que tout catholique admet."[56] But the forces at work in Faustus' profession of faith are behind Fortunatus' as well:

> And this is our profession: God is incorruptible […] he dwells in an eternal light of his own […]. But he sent a savior like himself. The Word, born at the foundation of the world, when he made the world, came among human beings after the world was made.[57]

Apart from this summary, Fortunatus makes no mention of the Spirit. Neither his nor Faustus' formula identifies "Christ" with "Jesus"; and in neither, of course, can there really be a question of conforming precisely to the (anti-Arian) edict of 381.[58]

Returning now to Manichaeism's christology, Decret argues that its docetic aspects were more explicit and more widely held at Rome than in Africa, where the accent was on the "Christ spirituel."[59] But we have to keep in mind the apparent distinction between "Christ" and "Jesus" in the African version. Augustine never explicitly refers to "Jesus the Splendor": the closest he gets is in a reference to "ille per solem lunamque distentus,"[60] that is, Faustus' Son/Christ. The one called "Jesus" is the Light in its helpless, passive state, the *patibilis*, trapped and suffering in matter. For if "le mythe du *Jesus patibilis* n'est [pas] particulier […]

---

[56] Decret, *Aspects*, 233. It may be a similar consideration that keeps him from appealing to any Manichaean writing. See F. Decret, "La christologie manichéenne dans la controverse d'Augustin avec Fortunatus," *Augustinianum* 35 (1995): 444 (= *Essais*, 269).

[57] In Augustine, *C. Fort.* 3 (CSEL 25/1, 85.16 – 86.1): Et nostra professio ipsa est, quod incorruptibilis sit deus, quod lucidus, quod […] aeternam lucem et propriam habitet […]; sui similem saluatorem direxisse; uerbum natum a constitutione mundi cum mundum fabricaret. Transl. Teske, *The Manichaean Debate*, 146.

[58] See Grondijs, "Numidian Manicheism," 23; and L.J. van der Lof, "Der numidische Manichäismus im vierten Jahrhundert," *Studia Patristica 8: Papers presented to the Fourth International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1963*, Part II, Texte und Untersuchungen 93, F.L. Cross, ed. (Berlin, 1966), 121–25.

[59] Decret, "Le manichéisme présentait-il," 39 (= *Essais*, 239).

[60] Augustine, *C. Faustum* XX,11 (CSEL 25/1, 550.18–19). In reference to the Manichaean *Amatorium Canticum* Augustine mentions the *Splenditenens magnus: C. Faust.* 15,6 (CSEL 25/1, 428.7).

aux manichèens d'Afrique,"[61] but goes back to Manichaeism's roots,[62] the expression itself seems to be an African product.[63] Elsewhere, as in the *Kephalaia*, it would have been expressed through notions such as the "Cross of Light,"[64] perhaps in an attempt to avoid confusion

---

[61] Tardieu, "Vues nouvelles," 253–54. On *Iesus patibilis* see J. Ries, "Jésus la Splendeur, Jesus patibilis, Jésus historique dans les textes manichéens occidentaux," *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65. Geburtstag*, H. Preissler and H. Sewerts, eds. (Marburg, 1994), 238–41; Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie*, 93–109; and F. C. Baur, *Das Manichäische Religionssystem nach den Quellen neu untersucht und entwikelt* (Tübingen, 1831; repr. Göttingen, 1928; Hildesheim, 1973), 71–77. Baur suggests (75) that "die Vorstellung des *Jesus patibilis* […] vielleicht nur eine von den africanischen Manichäern angenommene war."

[62] Grondijs, "Analyse," 408: "Aucun document rédigé hors de l'Afrique proconsulaire [sic] et datant d'avant le VII[e] siècle, ne mentionne le terme «Jesus patibilis». Il est bien entendu que la notion qui y est indiquée, peut correspondre à un dogme probablement essentiel pour le manichéisme primitif, à savoir qu'une idée de fatalité et de souffrance s'attache à l'emprisonnement des parcelles de lumière ici-bas dans la matière." He also expresses the view (409) that "En Afrique proconsulaire, l'expression *Jesus patibilis* trahissait l'intention de prolonger la confusion et le camouflage de la doctrine secrète." So also N. A. Pedersen, "Early Manichaean Christology, Primarily in Western Sources," *Manichaean Studies*, P. Bryder, ed., 174–75; Decret, "La doctrine centrale," 150 n. 69; *idem*, "La doctrine du «Iesus patibilis» dans la polémique antijudaïque des manichéens d'Afrique" in *idem*, *Essais*, 248–49. G. Wurst, "Bemerkungen zum Glaubensbekenntnis des Faustus von Mileve (Augustinus, *Contra Faustum* 20,2)," *Studia Manichaica*, Emmerick *et al.*, eds., 653, believes that *Iesus patibilis* is less a dogmatic notion than a proselytizing tactic.

[63] E. Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie*, 89; and A. Böhlig, *Mysterion und Wahrheit: gesammelte Beiträge zur spätantiken Religionsgeschichte*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des späteren Judentums und des Urchristentums 6 (Leiden, 1968), 200 (= *idem*, "Der Manichäismus im Lichte der neueren Gnosisforschung," *Christentum am Nil*, K. Wessel, ed. [Recklinghausen, 1964], 122) and 218 (= *idem*, "Christliche Wurzeln im Manichäismus," *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte* 15 [1960]: 57); critiqued by Decret, "La doctrine du «Iesus patibilis»," 249 n. 39. Only Faustus, and Augustine from him, employ the expression: see Augustine, *C. Faustum* XX,11 (CSEL 25/1, 550.14–16): "Postremo dicite nobis, quot christos esse dicatis. aliusne est, quem de spiritu sancto concipiens terra patibilem gignit…" This would not necessarily mean that the doctrine behind the expression is confined to North African Manichaeism. See Decret, *Aspects*, 11–13, and "La doctrine," 248–49. Elsewhere Augustine accuses Faustus of proposing a *Christus ligatus*: *C. Faustum* II,5 and XX,13. Faustus does speak of this Christ as suffering a "mystical passion," a "mystical crucifixion symbolizing the wounds that are the passions of our souls" (XXXIII,1, 784.26–27: per eius scilicet mysticam passionem peruenire…; and XXXII,7, 766.20–22: credimus […] praeterea crucis eius mysticam fixionem, qua nostrae animae passiones monstrantur uulnera). On these passages see Wurst, "Bemerkungen zum Glaubensbekenntnis," 654. Faustus also refers to "the soul of the world": II,5 and XX,2 and 11.

[64] Pedersen, "Early Manichaean Christology," 174: "From the cosmogonean myth the imprisoned substance of Light should be the five sons of the Primal Man, but in Augustine it is named Jesus patibilis. A number of scholars have understood this conception as a special North African doctrine which was intended to facilitate the Manichaean mission among the members of the Catholic Church. This interpretation might have

by referring to too many Jesuses. The active, Light-guiding Jesus the Splendor, the one who himself resides in the visible moon and sun, is, then, Son or Christ or "Third Messenger,"[65] an identification peculiar to African Manichaeism. Evodius identifies the Third Messenger, a figure common throughout Manichaean literature, with the *beatus ille pater qui lucidas naues habet diuersorias*.[66] In light of the above remarks on *Iesus patibilis*, this would make the *tertius legatus* unequivocally christological,[67] an application made elsewhere, but here with the active principle "Jesus the Splendor,"[68] active because he awakens Adam from the sleep of death, that is, from demonic thralldom, and reveals to him the divine Light trapped in matter, and how it is to be freed.

Conclusion

If Augustine's experience is anything to go by, there was much in Manichaeism that appealed to North Africans; and that they put their own stamp on it seems beyond dispute.[69] However much off the mark Grondijs' notions of a separate "Numidian" Manichaeism might be,[70]

---

some support in the Coptic texts which designate the suffering particles of Light with other names, e.g. the Cross of Light." See also 185–86; Ries, "Jésus la Splendeur," 240–41; and Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie*, 96 and 99–103. However, the Cross of Light was also known in North Africa. See Augustine, *Enarratio in ps. 140*, 12.

[65] Coptic *Kephalaion* 16 (Böhlig, 49.26–28) makes the Third Messenger one of the triad that (along with the Column of Glory and "Light-powers") comprises the Fourth Majesty, whose mission it is to oversee the process of separating Light from matter and sending it on its way back to the divine realm. On the Third Messenger see Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie*, 167–71.

[66] Evodius, *De fide contra Manichaeos* 17 (CSEL 25/2, 957.32–958.1).

[67] On the Third Messenger see Coyle, *Augustine's "De moribus ecclesiae catholicae,"* 39 n. 173; and W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 10 (Göttingen, 1907), 74–77.

[68] Feldmann, *Die "Epistula Fundamenti"*, 73–74, 78–79. On Jesus the Splendor, see especially Pedersen, "Early Manichaean Christology," 163–65; and J. Ries, "Jésus la Splendeur," 236–38. In Coptic *Kephalaion* 16 (Böhlig, 49.23–31), Jesus the Splendor is identified with the "Fifth Majesty."

[69] Although E. de Stoop, *Essai sur la diffusion du Manichéisme dans l'Empire Romain* (Ghent, 1909), 89, is probably going too far in considering the Semitic origins of the inhabitants as a factor. Then again, on the Numidian temperament and the role it played in Donatism, see W. H. C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa* (Oxford, 1952), 25–140.

[70] Grondijs, "Analyse"; *idem*, "Numidian Manicheism," 21–42. But in the latter article the special characteristics of Manichaeism in Africa are not really Grondijs' focus, which is on Western forms generally. See Decret, "Le manichéisme présentait-il," 7 (= *Essais*, 209–10); and Van der Lof, "Der numidische Manichäismus," 118–29.

he is right to finger its singularity in the realms of trinitarian and christological thought,[71] and it remains that Manichaeism in Roman Africa demonstrated traits not found elsewhere. On the other hand, Decret maintains that African Manichaeans were especially concerned about practices, prohibitions, and rituals – externals, in other words – while in Italy the greater concern was with dogma.[72] I have not done a comparative study between Manichaeism in Rome (for which there is so much less evidence) and its African form; but to my mind, the evidence shows that North African Manichaeism was particularly sensitive to issues of doctrine.

[71] Grondijs, "Numidian Manicheism," 38–42.

[72] Decret, "Le manichéisme présentait-il," 28 (= *Essais*, 232). See also his long footnote 27 on 11–12 (= *Essais*, 214–15).

MANI'S ACCOUNT OF OTHER RELIGIONS ACCORDING TO THE COPTIC *SYNAXEIS* CODEX

Wolf-Peter Funk
Quebec City

How Manichaeans defined their relationship to other religions has been an issue of permanent interest in Manichaean studies, raising several questions to which there is no simple answer. Especially with regard to the Christian and Buddhist religions, this relationship also seems to have varied somewhat in the course of Manichaean history. But almost all the evidence we have had for a long time was focused on, and valid for, the opinions and attitudes displayed by *Manichaeans*, at various times and places – rarely those of Mani himself. I am not suggesting that Mani's own opinions were necessarily different from those of his followers. But the issue of relationship to other religious communities, and the views held about them, is an especially delicate one in the case of Manichaeism – given the varying *degrees* of inclusiveness and exclusiveness with regard to this or that religion – and therefore warrants our being careful not to over-generalize any conclusions that one might like to draw from one or the other particular statement. As far as Mani himself is concerned, I consider it likely that, if not his opinion, at least his perspective on these matters, based on his own experience, might have been somewhat different from that of his followers. Or in other words, the points that he felt he had to make – the aspects he personally considered most important to stress – may not have been exactly the same.

As can already be inferred from the testimony of the *CMC*, two rather different ways of talk can be found when Mani reports about his own activity and achievements. One is the self-assertive, boastful appraisal of his achievements as revealer and light-saver, a kind of ideological résumé of his role *sub specie aeternitatis*. The other, which will be the principal subject of this paper, is a much more down-to-earth narrative of personal experience with real groups of people, among whom he may or may not have been successful in spreading his superior knowledge.

As a point of departure, let us take a brief look at the first kind, for which the *CMC* provides an excellent example when it quotes the very

beginning of Mani's *Living Gospel*. After some introductory formulas, a series of statements of self-presentation, Mani's role and achievement in the universal salvation process is summarized:[1]

> I have proclaimed hope, I have revealed this revelation and written this immortal gospel. . . .What [he (i.e., the Father of Truth) revealed], I have shown it [to those who live on] the most truthful vision, which I have beheld, and on the most glorious revelation, which has been revealed to me.

This is where the *CMC* quote from the beginning of the *Gospel*, given towards the end of the second Barhaies report, breaks off, adding only two other excerpts which may have been taken from later parts of the same writing (or from elsewhere). In the unpublished Coptic *Synaxeis* codex[2] there is no actual overlap of text to be found, but the sentences quoted above can hardly be far away from the earliest pieces of readable text here, which I read likewise as text of the *Living Gospel*.[3] The top facing page of the unconserved book block (which hides the preceding text portions), is only in small parts readable but clearly continues in the same manner with numerous statements of the form "*I have* done this, *I have* done that," and this style appears to have prevailed until we reach the first lines of the first conserved page:[4]

> (I have set apart, *or sim.*) . . . [the living] offspring [. . .from] what is dead,
> the children of the light from (3) [the] offspring [of] darkness.
> I have separated the children of the height from the offspring of the
> abyss, the children of God (5) from the children of the enemy.
> I have distinguished the light-gods from the archons . . . etc.

---

[1] *CMC* 67,11–15; 67,22–68,5 (Koenen & Römer 1988, 46f.).

[2] The bulk of the codex has now returned from Berlin-Charlottenburg to the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, which had originally acquired it, and is there given the label "PCBM 5"; the 31 leaves of this codex that had been acquired by the Berlin museum bear the inventory number P. 15995. For further details, in particular the odyssey of the various parts of this codex, see Robinson 1992, 22–38 and 45.

[3] The first straightforward assertion that these *synaxeis* most probably contain excerpts from (and not commentaries on) chapters of Mani's *Living Gospel*, is found in King 1992, 286–8. A more tentative suggestion to the same effect, but without textual demonstration, can already be found in Böhlig 1968, 227.

[4] In terms of the inventory of the manuscript PCBM 5, this page is identifiable as the horizontal fibre side of the leaf labelled "Series VI, folio 24." In the forthcoming edition this will probably be called page 245. – NB: For maximum clarity I am indicating both kinds of numbers in all following quotations. The prospective "page numbers" are based on the assumption that the unconserved book block, usually estimated to contain about 100 leaves or a little more, can be assumed to hold a maximum of ten quires (= 240 pages) plus two leaves.

This fairly extensive, repetitive testimony in the 1st person singular is technically part of the First Discourse of the *Living Gospel* (elsewhere called Chapter Aleph), although from the point of view of literary structure it rather forms the main body of a general preamble to the work. This preamble can be assumed to be identical (or at least, co-extensive) with the "First Meeting" (1st *synaxis*) of that First Discourse, which culminates – after a paragraph of exhortation[5] – in Mani's exuberant praise of his own literary work,[6] followed by the litany of the twenty-two "Firsts," or "Primeval Voice" hymn,[7] and concluded by another litany, which assures the readers/listeners of finding in this work what they are looking for.[8] The remaining major parts of this chapter, that is, the Second to Fifth Meetings of the First Discourse,[9] have for their

[5] "Be luminous, be living, be strong, [be] listeners to knowledge! Raise your ears so that your hearing organs may be filled with knowledge through the messenger of the Father of Greatness," etc. (246, 4–7 = Series VI, f. 24 vert.).

[6] "This is is the new Gospel, the holy […] of truth, the great revelation of the things of the quality of Greatness, which makes public (5) the great secrets concerning all that happened and concerning all that will happen, from the beginning to [the end] – the one that reveals and instructs about the interpretation [of the] twenty-two *logoi* of the primeval alphabet, from which the worlds borrowed and through which (10) they were sown out." (247, 2–10 = Series VI, f. 23 hor.). Cf. also the partial quote in the *Homilies*, 43, 20f., where the text can be restored to read "He sealed it (i.e., the *Gospel*) in/by twenty-two *logoi*, in/by the primeval alphabet."

[7] This place, towards the end of the preamble of Mani's *Gospel* and shortly after proclaiming the mysterious relationship of the work to the primeval alphabet, would appear to be the canonical anchoring of the "Primeval Voice" hymn with its twenty-two items. It was only in a much later tradition, as attested by one particular version (the Chinese-Sogdian), that this hymn was either attributed to Jesus as author (!) or meant to be a praise of his aspects and thus ended up in the classical 1926 Waldschmidt-Lentz records on the *Stellung Jesu*. For a critical reassessment and presentation, and illuminating commentary, of the hymn in its various Iranian versions see Morano 1982. I am very grateful to Enrico Morano for explaining to me the identity and peculiarity of this piece during the congress. In the *Synaxeis* codex, this hymn is only very fragmentarily preserved and needs a great deal of restoration, which is of course helped by knowledge of the Iranian parallels.

[8] According to the pattern, "The children of long-suffering will find long-suffering in it, the gentle children will taste gentleness through it, the children of hope will see hope in it," etc. (248 = Series VI, f. 23 vert.).

[9] A fairly good impression of the way in which the individual chapters called *synaxis* relate to the twenty-two Discourses of the *Living Gospel*, of which some are omitted, can be obtained from Mirecki 1988 (although the catalogue presented there would now need some updating). These *synaxeis* in fact occupy only the central part of the extensive codex, starting near the end of the unconserved book block and extending through most of the conserved series of leaves (down to what is called "series 1"), thus covering the remains of more than 200 pages. They are followed in the codex by several concluding texts (more than 100 pages) of unknown affiliation (among them, one entitled *The Sermon of the Gospel*).

topic the description of the Father of Greatness, the realm of light, and the beauty of the light aeons.

While the Second Discourse (comprised in a single "meeting") gives a description of the other side, namely, what is going on inside the realm of darkness, the real action and dramatic plot begins to unfold with the Third Discourse, here divided into at least four, possibly more, "meetings." It starts with the perception, on the part of the light aeons, of the impending danger and evil schemes of the other side and continues with the preparations for battle. A series of other Discourses (for the most part less well preserved than the earlier ones) are still dedicated to various aspects of the mythical drama; these parts extend at least as far as the Tenth Discourse, possibly further. Then, starting at least with the Fifteenth Discourse, possibly earlier, Mani finds occasion to report on more personal subjects and therefore to refer to groups of "real people" of his own day.

The passages from the Coptic *Synaxeis* codex that I wish to present here as accounts of "other religions" can almost certainly also be read as fragmentary pieces from chapters of Mani's *Living Gospel*, but they all belong to this later section of the book, situated after the principal chapters of mythological contents. Supposing my codicological order (and reading of chapter titles) is correct, most of the quotations would belong to various "meetings" of the Fifteenth Discourse of the *Gospel*, with the exception only of the last one.

The first two passages concern the Elchasaites or, as they are called in the *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis*, the "*dogma* of the Baptists". There is no explicit identification of the sect to be found in the extant lines of these *Synaxeis* pages, but after the huge amount of information that we can gather from the *CMC*, a few cues found among the text fragments of this part of the *Synaxeis* codex cannot fail to tell us that what Mani is talking about is indeed the Baptist sect and the place where he spent his early youth:[10]

> …(12)…the *dogma* and…*(2 lines illegible)* […]…(15)…in the *nomos*…(16) […]…among them…*(2 lines illegible)* (18) […]…and the birth/generation of the body […]…they nourished my body alone (20) […]…in that *dogma* […]…and its presbyters […]…my body…that I should do […]…thus I did not trust them when I was small…

[10] 383, 12–23 = Series 1955, f. 6 vert.

Note the repeated reference Mani here makes to "my body" – which I suggest ought to be taken into account in discussions of the somewhat ambiguous book title of the *CMC*, "On the birth/generation of his body," with its possible meanings and implications.[11] The *Gospel* fragment quoted above clearly confirms what may already be inferred from certain *CMC* passages such as that on pages 102–103,[12] that is to say, that Mani himself tended to mention his body and its "feeding" or "nourishment" when he talked about his earlier life with the sect.[13] Whether this talk, by way of a narrative, is situated in an explanation that Mani gives to his Twin about the reasons for his great sadness (as is the case in the Timotheos account of the *CMC*) or whether it is found to be situated at the primary narrative level of the *Gospel*, cannot be determined on the basis of the fragments. But it is interesting to see that on the verso page of the same leaf, after another mention of nourishment (line 19, "…to me, with me feeding") as well as a few other things, a dialogue with "my true and most honoured Twin" is either initiated or continued,[14] and in this context again, mention is made of "the *dogmata* that walk about in error" (line 22) and "the children of the *nomos*" (line 27).

On another leaf of the same series ("1955") but quite a few pages further down the text we find some readable remains of what surely was a more detailed description of Mani's more problematic experience when living among the sect:[15]

[11] It should be noted that the "genetic" terms in connection with the body are neatly equivalent on both sides, with the Coptic expression (*t-cin-jpo*) pointing to some birth-like production at least as distinctly as the Greek γέννα in the case of the *CMC*.

[12] Koenen/Römer 1988, 72f.

[13] It may be interesting to note that in Psalm 42, which belongs to the group called "Psalms of the Synaxeis" in the Coptic Manichaean *Psalm-Book*, Part One (presently being prepared for publication by Siegfried Richter), there occurs a passage that could perhaps be restored to read "[they nour]ished his body until he came…(lac.)…away from the error" (*PsBk* I, 77, 24f.). But the strophe in which this line occurs is the 16th among the twenty-two strophes parallel to the twenty-two Discourses of the *Living Gospel*, whereas the section that provides the text quoted above must be identified as belonging to Discourse 15.

[14] By the way, this page (384 = Series 1955, 6 hor.) is probably the only one with references to "my Twin" (twice: lines 16 and 28); all other occurrences of one or the other "twin" in the *Synaxeis* codex seem to refer to beings other than Mani's Twin, especially in various mythological contexts.

[15] 391, 10–26 = Series 1955, f. 2 hor.

(The first ten lines are hardly legible; lines 3f. probably "they are the children [of the *no*]*mos*"[16] and the term *trophē*, 'food' or 'feeding', in illegible context)

(10)…in a…way, according to individual *nomoi* (or "*nomos* by *nomos*"). They did…[…]…They separated plant from plant, vegetable from vegetable, [herb] from herb (?). And so did I. I separated (?)…[…]…their outrage, according to their *nomos*,…(15)…*(3 lines entirely illegible)*…I took it from them, they being…[…] consideration. In this way I chanced upon (?)…[…] (20)…they…by his/its *schēma*, by his/its *typos*, thus […] outside. I went into the monasteries [which (25) belonged (?)] to them. They (?) desired […] outside and [inside (?)…]…in it. *(A few other lines, but illegible)*

The one thing that really makes clear reading on this fragment is the "separation" or "distinction" practised by the Baptists between different kinds of plants and vegetables, that is, accepting some while rejecting others. This practice, which in the *CMC* accounts is somewhat obscured by vague formulations[17] and becomes explicit only indirectly in the comments on some Jesus logia (*CMC* 93),[18] seems to be the principal point of reproach that Mani here makes to the sect – a practice from which he is supposed to have distanced himself not without personal trouble, after adhering to it for a long time. As regards the other points of great importance in the *CMC* accounts, neither the issue of "wheat bread" (or "Greek bread") nor that of "washing" is anywhere evident in the extant fragments. The "monasteries" that Mani reports to have visited (l. 24) appear to belong to the same religious group (although this is not entirely certain, given the illegible space preceding this passage).

As far as foreign religions are concerned – "foreign", that is, to Mesopotamia – there is only one personal encounter of Mani's recounted on the extant fragments, and this must have happened during Mani's famous voyage to India. But while most other sources that inform us about events that happened during this journey focus on the unique success story, the conversion of the Turan-shah in an apparently Buddhist environment, this *Gospel* passage instead reflects the frustration that Mani must have experienced in Hinduist (and more particularly Brahmanist) milieus. The emphasis that he puts on their being organized into castes,

---

[16] The Elchasaites seem to be the only religious group for which, apart from the category of *dogma*, also the term *nomos* is used by Mani (cf. *CMC* 79, 16; Koenen/Römer 1988, 54f.).

[17] Cf. the exegetical footnote 2 in Koenen/Römer 1988, 63.

[18] Koenen/Römer 1988, 64f.

being firmly grounded in their own traditions, and their unwillingness to listen to any outsider can only mean that he found them more or less inaccessible for his own (early) missionary efforts.

The page that carries this report belongs to the same series of leaves as that about the Baptists and may belong to just another "meeting" (apparently preceding the one that deals with Twin and Elchasaites) but the same Discourse of the *Living Gospel*. A preliminary translation of the very first reading of this page was already published many years ago[19] and I am now in a position to give a somewhat fuller account of this passage, thanks to more decipherment and restoration:[20]

> *(Remains of the first few lines illegible)*…little by little (5) […]…the error of their *nomos*. But…[…]…error…They have already dissolved [and…] them in/by the bond of the *nomos*, by way of the *(pl.)*…[…]. They were…away on account of its error. Thus [I…] little by little and I drew many away from the error (10) [of the] *nomos*. I led them from death to life, for I [am…] against them (?)…according to their…(12) for a time.
>
> I…their (?)…in the countries of the land (?) of the east, of In[dia]. (14) In that place [I encountered (?)] many sects *(dogma)* and castes (15) [which (?)…]…except for [their] *nomos*, while the…(16) […]…through one another, according to the…(17) […] that place, the ones that I distinguished – caste by caste, *dogma* by *dogma*. In that place I took a close look at (19) the caste of the Brahmans (and found out) that they were strong and settled in their (20)…in the land of the east. They are respected in their [caste (?)…]…other *dogma(ta)*. Now, their *nomos* is the following. I took (22) a close look at their *nomos* and found that (?) the leaders and the teachers […]…in prophecy and ascesis, in special skills (εὐμηχανία) (24)…the hair of their head. It is to their own teachers that they listen – ever since (?) [their] prophets, their fathers.
>
> When I saw myself that they were (26) in such a manner opposed and incapable of listening to any other but their own…and their *nomos*, that they are lined up ("in rank and file"? στοιχεῖν) and are (28) […]…their caste and did not search outside of…[…]…their *nomos*. As soon as [I (?)…] (30)…[…]…my head, I sought after…[…]…I travelled around in their countries…(32) […]…, I…the disposition which […]…their places which…(34) […I (?)] said (?), "Your *nomos*, which…[…]… which…*(end of page)*

As those last lines of fragmentary text indicate, there must have been a brief record of dialogue between Mani and some Indians, the contents of which are largely lost in the lacunas; but this dialogue seems to have

[19] King 1992, 287.
[20] 379 = Series 1955, f. 8 vert.

extended over most of the next page. After the first seven lines of that verso page (which are almost completely lost), there are a few legible words which, although narrative, would still be compatible with such a dialogue: "I translated/interpreted all the greatnesses (?) from their signs (?) to their…"; and after that, other dialogue elements are found in the more legible lines 20–26 (among them: "all the things that you have told us are of light," "we have heard that…," twice "the first fathers," and "from generation to generation"). But unfortunately we have no means of figuring out how this story ends.

The last passage I wish to quote here bears no visible relationship to Mani's biography or personal experience, but still seems to be an excerpt from the *Living Gospel*, most likely from its Eighteenth or Nineteenth Discourse. It concerns – directly or indirectly – the Hebrew religion or, to put it more cautiously, apparently some part of the Hebrew *people* or, at any rate, a group of people who are somehow connected with biblical traditions. Given the clearly hostile position that Manichaeans and, for that matter, certainly Mani himself usually take towards all things Jewish,[21] this passage surprises by its apparently fairly neutral, almost sympathetic, tone. Thus it can hardly be meant to deal with the ancestors of the Jewish community of Mani's day, but perhaps with some tribe of "Israelites" before they adopted the fatal Mosaic Law. It is clear enough that the passage takes up a very essential part of biblical narrative anchored in the Pentateuch: the story of the exodus from Egypt. The purpose of this part of the discourse, however, seems to be an etymological speculation about the two words *sina* and *skhina*,[22] possibly taken to be in some sort of opposition. Even though the actual logical connection between the two terms remains unclear, it seems that at least for a few lines this lexical play is the main point – rather than an explanation of the religious orientation of the people

[21] Cf., for example, the passage in *1Keph* 159, 1–7, where the authority speaking in Deut 17.2–5, prohibiting any worship of the sun, is identified as Satan. But it is quite possible that scholars tend to overstate the case: here again, Mani's own stance may have been somewhat "less Manichaean" than that of his followers. If, for instance, one reads Chapter 6 of the *Kephalaia* (and its description of the dark kings) as implicitly supplying a list of rejected religious groups, one notes that it mentions magical practice (*1Keph* 31, 22–33), the Zoroastrian fire cult (33, 16f.), pagan idolatry (33, 21–24), and Baptists (33, 29–32), but not the Jews [this fact was brought to my attention by Timothy Pettipiece].

[22] As a possible *locus classicus* of the confusion between Hebrew *s'neh* (= *cassia obovata*, for the "burning thorn-bush" in Ex 3.2–4) and *sinai* (the name of the mountain), cf. the conjectural emendations that are traditionally proposed for the text of Deut 33.16.

the text is talking about, and who are graciously identified as "the seed of Abraham."[23] From the imperfect remains of papyrus and ink, this is what I have been able to retrieve and tentatively translate:[24]

> *(Nothing readable of the first five lines of that page, and next to nothing of the preceding one)* . . . (6) . . . [he] chose the tribe, . . . [the] entire [country] . . . [He] . . . their . . . so that they . . . (10) godhead. Later on, [he] . . . in order to [. . .], that is (?), the *skhina*[25] . . . , in order to seize . . . [. . .] (12) . . . set free (?) her army. Finally, then, after having [. . .] (13) . . . the seed of Abraham, she (?) . . . them off.[26] They . . . and they . . . (15) . . . the slavery and the humiliation . . . [. . .] . . . (forced?) labor. So they departed from Egypt [and passed (17) through (?)] the field of the mountain of *sina* (that is, Mount Sinai). There were great [quantities (18) of] thistles [growing (?)] in that [place (?)]. Now, the thistle is called *sina* in the language of that place . . . (20) [. . .] . . . (21) [That is why (?)] that mountain had been named . . . [. . .] . . . *skhina*, after the name of the thorn-tree with which [the whole place (?)] is filled. (23) [. . .] . . . These Babylonians released (?) . . . [. . .] . . . and they . . . in it. They seized [the land (?) of] . . . (25) . . . and became kings in it. . . . *(2 lines illegible)* . . . (27) . . . Euphrates . . . (29) . . . these Chal[daeans (?)] (30) [. . .] . . . in (?) Hebrew . . . [. . .] . . . (32) [. . .] . . . in Babylon . . . [. . .] . . . *(next to end of page)*

Several questions may be raised with regard to this fragment of the *Gospel*. For example, why does Mani apparently adopt from typical Pentateuch traditions not only stories about the very first, pre-flood human generations, such as Enoch or the giants, but also certain post-flood events? Could it be that he valued at least some of the Patriarchs approvingly and dated the fatal "error" in the religious history of the Hebrew people only with Moses, the one who gave them their *nomos* –

---

[23] Cf. the "ethnic identity" role that the expression σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ carries, for instance, in Jn 8.33 (and elsewhere in the New Testament gospels) or Rom 9.7; 11.1; 2Cor 11.22 (and elsewhere in the Pauline epistles). On the other hand, passages like Jn 8.37–40 might have been reason enough for Mani to see a link between the *real* "seed of Abraham" and the true religion.

[24] 422 = Series 1, 1951, f. 12 hor.

[25] The fragmentary context being syntactically rather inconclusive, it cannot be excluded that the word is here used in a construction that states the meaning of the word, for instance, "*skhina* is/means great thistle" (supposing that the other word, not translated above, which is likewise puzzling may indeed be understood as a noun *sar-o* 'great thistle' with zero article, as I tend to think). But even so, the point of the lexical opposition between *skhina* and *sina* remains utterly unclear.

[26] The female being apparently referred to both in "*her* army" and the acting "she" cannot be identified because of the many lacunas; it cannot be "the *skhina*" since this word has a masculine determiner. What with our ignorance as to what it actually means, it is even conceivable that *pskhina* does not represent "the *skhina*" but, with the possessive article, "her *khina*" (though this seems unlikely).

or even later? If the numerous lacunas do not lead us astray in this regard, it looks as if Moses is not mentioned at all, which would be more than remarkable in a text that relates the exodus from Egypt and the passage of Mount Sinai. It talks about "thorn-trees" as being a typical phenomenon of the landscape, but not – or at least, not explicitly[27] – about the famous singular "thorn-bush", through which Moses' revelation was transmitted. If my readings are correct, however, the most intriguing aspect of this fragment might be the apparent reception and possible development, on Mani's part, of the ancient tradition about Abraham as of Chaldaean origin (Gen 11.28 and 31), and by inference, therefore, a leader of a group of "Babylonian" people, in other words, of cousins to the ancestors of those living in Mani's own country. At any rate, the fact that after "these Babylonians" both the Euphrates and Babylon are mentioned at the bottom of this page, and more of this kind is said on the page immediately following this one,[28] makes it clear that the geographical context of the passage and the people involved is Mesopotamia. If the writer of this chapter had any missionary efforts on his mind when he made the connection between "the seed of Abraham" and the indigenous population of his country, we still could not be sure whether, in religious terms, his focus was on Christians, Jews, or other folk.[29]

Taking into account some readable fragments of phrases from the next page – in particular, "those Babylonians who belong to the ancient *dogma*" and "[people who] worship in that temple"[30] – one can hardly avoid the impression that Mani is talking about two groups of people

---

[27] That is to say, he may have had the "thorn-bush" in mind or implied some of its significance as it is commonly understood if the obvious conclusion is correct that the enigmatic *skhina* mentioned in the text originally refers to the Aramaic word meaning '(divine) dwelling'. But unfortunately, no satisfactory context can be given for the unique occurrence of this word here; thus it even remains unclear whether this is meant in an accepting or a more critical manner.

[28] This following page (423 = Series 1, 1951, f. 11 hor., very poorly preserved) again mentions the Euphrates river and the Babylonians, but it also contains a phrase that says "from the land of the Egyptians to the country of […]" (line 11) and later talks about "[people who] worship in that temple" (lines 20 and 21), starting a new sentence with "Those Babylonians who belong to the ancient [*dogma*]" (lines 21f.), though what is said about them is hardly readable, except for the fact that once again naming is involved.

[29] Most surprisingly, the next topic after those mentioned in the preceding note, starting only a few lines later and apparently without any clear break in between, involves some sort of Christological discussion: "Jesus" [line 26], "while they say about him that…" [line 31], and, on the other side of the leaf, "the son of Mary" [line 20]!

[30] See note 28.

which can both claim to be called "Babylonians" and that the former one ("the seed of Abraham") is simply thought to be distinct from those adhering to the ancient religion (the pagans), which means, distinct with regard to their religion. If this can be assumed as a contextual setting for the whole section, then it becomes likely – as several participants in this congress[31] suggested to me – that the former group is to be identified with the Mandaean community. From their own literature, Mandaeans are known to have cultivated peculiar versions of the Exodus tradition, although these are mostly viewed in a hostile manner in the sources available to us.[32] The hostile presentation, however, could be due to a secondary twist, and the mere presence and elaboration of these traditions in Mandaean literature may suggest that they were perhaps seen in a different light in earlier times.[33] Be that as it may, at least at the demographic level, the Mandaean community seems to be the primary candidate when we are looking for a religious dissident group of substantial size in third-century Mesopotamia. Colleagues more competent than myself in the history of Aramaic communities assured me that there are good reasons to assume that the Mandaeans made up a substantial part of the people who inhabited Babylonian

[31] Notably, and independently from one another, Erica Hunter and Kurt Rudolph; other participants confided to me later that they had had the same idea.

[32] Cf., e.g., *Right Ginza* 381f. (Lidzbarski 1925, 410), where Abraham as a tribal ancestor (albeit of the Jews) and the exodus from Egypt are mentioned in the same context. Since these events are said to occur under the guidance of Adonai and Ruha, however, any identification on the part of the Mandaeans themselves with this tradition appears to be excluded. Note, however, the rather ambiguous reference to Abraham in the Sinai section of the *Right Ginza* (45f., Lidzbarski 1925, 43), where the Jews are said to have falsified the Law and to have "falsified the works of Abraham, the prophet of Ruha, on Mount Sinai."

[33] It may be interesting in this connection to take a look at the book that, according to Lady Drower, is widely considered by modern Mandaeans to be "the true history of their race" (Drower 1953: v), the *Haran Gawaita* (I am grateful to Jason BeDuhn for having drawn my attention to this work). Although the Pentateuch (and Jerusalem) traditions are hardly seen in a less hostile light where they are mentioned in the book itself, the amalgamation process suggested to be at the origin of the Mandaean community by various particular traits of this work (and strongly argued by Drower in her introduction) leaves considerable room for a more diversified reception of typically "Jewish" traditions. I do not know how much historical depth, if any, can be attributed to an orally communicated assertion such as the one reported by Drower (1953, vii, quoted from her earlier work), "Abraham was of our people – we called him Bahram," which is the name that in the literature usually appears as Bihram (cf. his role as the possible founder of Mandaean baptism rites, "the baptism of the great Bihram, son of the mighty," *ibid.*, 6f., n. 9). If there was any chance for similar equations in antiquity, one may assume that Mani was likely to adopt the more "Christian" variant of that name.

Mesopotamia around the third century, possibly as much as one third of the entire population.

The issue of the relationship between Mandaean and Manichaean religions and literatures – once a privileged topic of discussion and looked upon with heightened interest after Säve-Söderbergh's pioneering study of the Manichaean Psalm-Book[34] – was pushed to the background and lost much of its pertinance once it became clear, through the *CMC*, that the Baptist community Mani grew up in was not the Mandaean one. But this does not necessarily mean that Mandaean doctrines and activities were of no interest or consequence to Mani. If the hypothetical interpretation of the "seed of Abraham" of our *Synaxeis* passage in terms of Mandaeans is correct, it might be about time to renew our interest in the historical relationship between these two faiths.

[34] Säve-Söderbergh 1949.

Bibliography

Böhlig, Alexander
1968 Zu den Synaxeis des Lebendigen Evangeliums, *Mysterion und Wahrheit*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des späteren Judentums und des Urchristentums 6 (Leiden).
Cirillo, Luigi
2001 *Concordanze del «Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis»*, Pubblicazioni dell' Istituto di Scienze religiose in Trento, series maior, 7 (Bologna).
Drower, E. S.
1953 *The Haran Gawaita and the Baptism of Hibil-Ziwa*, Studi e Testi 176 (Città del Vaticano).
King, Karen
1992 A progress report on the editing of the Manichaean *Synaxeis* codex, *Actes du IVe Congrès copte. Vol. II: De la linguistique au gnosticisme*, M. Rassart-Debergh and J. Ries, eds. (Louvain-la-Neuve), 281–288.
Koenen, Ludwig, and Cornelia Römer
1988 *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex: Über das Werden seines Leibes*, *Kritische Edition*, Papyrologica Coloniensia 14 (Opladen).
Lidzbarski, Mark
1925 *Ginzā: Der Schatz oder Das große Buch der Mandäer* (Göttingen).
Mirecki, Paul Allen
1988 The Coptic Manichaean Synaxeis Codex: Descriptive catalogue of synaxis chapter titles, *Manichaean Studies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism*, Lund Studies in African and Asian Religions, 1, Peter Bryder, ed. (Lund), 135–145.
Morano, Enrico
1982 The Sogdian Hymns of *Stellung Jesu*, *East and West* 32: 9–43 (and plates).
Robinson, James M.
1992 The fate of the Manichaean codices of Medinet Madi 1929–1989, *Studia Manichaica: II. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus*, Studies in Oriental Religions 23, G. Wießner & H.-J. Klimkeit, eds. (Wiesbaden).
Säve-Söderbergh, Torgny
1949 *Studies in the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book: Prosody and Mandaean parallels* (Uppsala).

HOW WE KNOW THE EXACT YEAR THE ARCHEGOS LEFT BAGHDAD

Cyril Glassé
New York

An-Nadim informs us that the Manichaean Archegos left Baghdad in the reign of the Caliph al-Muqtadir. This was from the year 908 to the year 932, a time window of twenty-four years. However, the great French Islamicist Louis Massignon wrote in *The Passion of al-Hallaj* that the Manichaean "patriarch, who was tolerated at Ctesiphon, the Sassanid capital (with the symbolic title of 'Babel'), was watched closely by the Muslim police from the very beginning of the conquest; and ended up by being exiled to Soghdiana *precisely* in 296/908."[1] Massignon did not explain how he knew the precise year. His translator, Herbert Mason, told me that he did not know either. Nevertheless, by long reflection (and it takes a long time to go through those four volumes of Massignon's), the logic of Massignon's statement becomes quite clear and the details that become apparent are rather interesting.

It should be noted that Massignon was very well informed on Manichaeism. Al-Hallaj, Massignon's hero, was executed for Manichaeism in the year 922. Before Massignon, it was assumed by scholars that al-Hallaj really had been a Manichaean. In 1902, E. G. Browne wrote, "what we learn [of Hallaj's writings] as to the sumptuous manner in which they were written out, sometimes with gold ink, on Chinese paper, brocade, silk and the like, and magnificently bound, reminds us strongly of the Manicheans. In short, as to the extreme unorthodoxy of this Persian, whose near ancestors had held the Magian faith, there can be little doubt…"[2] Not to mention that Hallaj's actual doctrines cleverly weave Manichaeism into Islam, and his cryptic statements, like "I am an orphan but I have a Father," glow with double meaning in the light of modern scholarship.

---

[1] Louis Massignon, *The Passion of al-Hallaj*, Herbert Mason, tr. (Princeton, 1982), Vol. 1, 381. The Islamic year 296 ran from 30 September 908 to 20 September 909.

[2] E. G. Browne, *Literary History of Persia* (Cambridge, 1964), Vol. 1, 362.

Yet, in the new edition of the *Encyclopedia of Islam*, in the article *Nur* ("Light"), we read: "The first representatives of a metaphysics of light in Islam readily fell under the suspicion of Manichaeism . . . many mystics also (e.g., al-Halladj, according to Massignon, Passion 150–1, wrongly) were accused of this dualism." Wrongly accused of Manichaeism? Now, after Massignon, we find that the contemporary authorities who tried al-Hallaj twice with deliberations that ran for years in the tenth century were misinformed!

What Massignon accomplished was to posthumously argue as a lawyer in a Court of Appeals for al-Hallaj and to acquit him of the accusations and judgment of the original trial in Baghdad. In doing so, Massignon learned a great deal about the Manichaeans and went so far as to calculate how much lettuce – the Manichaean staple – had to be grown in ʿIraq to feed what he called Hallajians (432 Hectares were used to grow lettuce for the "Hallajians" of Baghdad). That is why he knows "precisely" when the Archegos left Baghdad, because, as he says, already in 910 "Hallajians" were being rounded up and arrested.[3] This is a reconstruction of his deductions, along with some choice additions that Massignon did not know, which further the argument.

The Palace Intrigue of 908

Al-Muqtadir, the 18th ʿAbbasid Caliph, succeeded his elder brother al-Muktafi on *13 Qaʿdah 295*/August 14, 908 when he was thirteen years old. He was deposed soon after, for a day, on *20–21 Rabiʿ 296*/December 17–18, 908, by his cousin ʿAbu-lʿAbbas ibn al-Muʿtazz al-Muntasif bi-Llah, and, before the end of his reign, for three days (February 28 – March 2, 929), by his brother al-Qahir bi-Llah. Al Muqtadir was finally killed in *320*/932.

Ibn al-Muʿtazz (861–908), the grandson of the Caliph al-Mutawakkil, was the son of the Caliph al-Muʿtazz, who himself had been put on the throne in 866 until 869 by the Turkish Guards of Samarraʾ when the Caliph al-Mustaʿin fled from them to Baghdad. A poet, he wrote "The Epistles," a miniature epic of 450 iambic couplets celebrating the reign of his cousin, the Caliph al-Muʿtadid, which Browne called the "nearest approximation to an epic poem to be found in Arabic

[3] Massignon, *The Passion of al-Hallaj*, Vol. 2, 473.

literature." He also wrote works on poetics influenced by Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, which had recently been translated into Arabic. He had led a life away from politics, extolling the pure Arabic of the Beduins while occupying himself with literary criticism. But he was opposed to Twelve Imam Shiʿites.

Al-Muqtadir was put, and kept, on the throne by Twelve Imam Shiʿite bankers and Shiʿite secretaries. The unsuccessful backers of Ibn al-Muʿtazz (known as "the Caliph for a day") were Sunnis and mainly Sunni secretaries, government clerks, for their revolt was a palace revolt only. Evidently, Massignon saw in this struggle between Sunni and Shiʿite backers, groups which were more or less dangerous, or more or less tolerant, as regards the Archegos and Manichaeism in general. The Shiʿites, who were on the rise in influence, were the party which was more opposed to the Manichaeans than ordinary Sunnis, who had little understanding of what Manichaeans were. The "Hidden Imam" of the Twelve Imam Shiʿites, through his representative the Wakil, condemned al-Hallaj to death for Crypto-Manichaeism in 917, five years before al-Muqtadir, out of hesitation, signed the court's decision for the same crime. Shiʿites were the ones who, much more than the Sunnis, understood the Manichaeans. After all, many of the Shiʿites were Manichaeans.

If you have ever tried to explain Gnosticism to someone, you will appreciate the difficulty they would have in recognizing Gnosis when it is not pointed out, and especially the difficulty such non-initiates would experience in recognizing Gnosis when it was disguised – and disguise was the rule, since Gnosis was officially looked down upon and even persecuted by the Islamic state. But the Shiʿites were themselves initiates, they are themselves Gnostics (which is why there are very few Sufi orders in Iran, their function being carried out instead by the inherent mysticism of the state religion). The Shiʿites can perceive a Gnostic at a distance and even in disguise. And being Gnostics, they were less tolerant of Gnostics of different stripes. And Gnostics of different stripes is what the so-called "Sunni" secretaries who staged the palace revolt actually were, and not really orthodox Muslims, for reasons which follow.

Massignon recognized that the defeat of Ibn al-Muʿtazz's party, and the victory of the Shiʿites, was a struggle between Manichaeans and Shiʿites for the control of the nominally Sunni Caliphate, and it signaled the coming of the final peril for the Archegos which precipitated his departure from Baghdad, according to an-Nadim, for Sogdiana

(although there, too, the Manichaeans were being persecuted, they gained toleration by counter-threats from the Uygur ruler of Qocho-Turfan, in Chinese Turkestan).

Besides the attempted *coup d'état* of Ibn al-Muʿtazz in December in the year 908, there was also a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the constellation of Aries on the 13th of March. The Ismaʿilis used the conjunction of these two planets, astrologically related to royalty and dynasty, as propaganda to create expectations of historical changes of cosmic proportions. More than 60 years earlier they had planted what they purported were ancient prophecies regarding these conjunctions. The prophecies spoke of a series of seven such conjunctions, the last of which would restore the world order to what it had been before Islam. Al-Biruni reported this as a prophecy which said that the Magians would be brought back to power. An earlier conjunction had taken place in 895 and the last of the prophesied series took place in 928. Belatedly, in 930 the Black Stone was stolen from Mecca by the Qarmati Ismaʿilis and kept hidden in East Arabia until it was returned in 951 by being hurled in a sack into the main Mosque of Kufah, after having been deliberately shattered into seven pieces and crumbs. Since then, Muslims, like in a dream, have been circling a substitute center: Mani in place of ʿAli; Mani's black stone in place of Muhammad's black stone.

Background: the Rise of the ʿAbbasids

To unravel the threads of these events and their significance, we have to go back to the beginning of the ʿAbbasid dynasty. The ʿAbbasids in 716 stumbled upon a mysterious connection which their cousins, the descendants of ʿAli, had to a clandestine revolutionary group in ʿIraq.[4] In 685, this group, called the Kaysaniyyah and also known as the Mukhtariyyah, had captured Kufah, which was the successor to the city of Hirah, center of Arab Manichaeism and capital of the Lakhmids, who had been either Manichaeans or pro-Manichaean. The leader of this revolutionary group and the revolt which bears his name was Mukhtar ibn Abu ʿUbayd ath-Thaqafi, the nephew of the Caliph ʿAli's governor in Madaʾin-Ctesiphon. After taking part in ʿAbd

[4] See M. Sharon, *Black Banners from the East* (Leiden, 1983).

Allah ibn az-Zubayr's Arab Muslim revolt against the Umayyads, he appeared in ʿIraq claiming to be inspired by the Angel Gabriel and, in verse imitative of the Koran, preached the appearance of the Mahdi, a divinely guided leader, who would eliminate injustice on the earth. Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah, one of the sons of the Caliph ʿAli, was, in secret, this very Mahdi.[5]

Raising a force of discontented *mawali*, Aramaic and Persian Muslim converts who were, by necessity, clients of the occupying Arabs, Mukhtar put them under the command of Ibrahim ibn al-Malik al-Ashtar, the chief of the Nakhʾ tribe of Madhhij, a Shiʿite leader in Kufah and the son of one of the Caliph ʿAli's generals. In Rabi I 66/October 685, they succeeded in taking Kufah. The forces of Mukhtar won several victories in ʿIraq and defeated a Syrian army led by ʿUbayd Allah ibn Ziyad, the Umayyad governor who had sent troops against Husayn at Kerbala. ʿUbayd Allah ibn Ziyad was killed, and Mukhtar celebrated the victory by a ceremony in front of an empty throne, which was represented as being "a chair belonging to ʿAli" – in Arabic *kursi ʿAli* – whose keeper, according to Tabari, in the city of Kufah at one time was a man called Hawshab.[6] Arabs of ʿAli's generation did not have chairs, much less thrones; they sat on the ground. This throne, to which Mukhtar spoke in speech difficult for Arabs to understand, which was Aramaic, was the seat of the presence of God. In this ceremony, and in his speeches, Mukhtar made extensive use of *sajʿ* or rhyme, like a *kahin* or shaman.

This ceremony of the empty chair looks so temptingly like the Manichaean Bema Ceremony that…it must be the Bema Ceremony. And it links the Mukhtariyyah/Kaysaniyyah to the Manichaeans whose center among the Arabs had been Hirah, the Lakhmid capital. The Lakhmids were dispossessed when Islam expanded, and their capital Hirah dwindled away as the population moved to the newly founded

---

[5] This is the first time the *Mahdi* idea appeared in Islamic history. The latest was in 1979, when a *coup d'état* was attempted in Saudi Arabia, and the Grand Mosque of Mecca seized, by a group of religious students who promoted one of themselves as a *Mahdi*. He was from the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia. The Eastern Province was the region controlled by Qarmatis in the 10th century and is today the only part of Saudi Arabia which is Twelve Imam Shiʿite. The stolen Black Stone of the Kaʿbah of Mecca was hidden there, in the city of Hofuf.

[6] An Ibn Hawshab, or "son of Hawshab," shows up as an architect of the transfer of Ismaʿili operations from Syria and ʿIraq to North Africa, and the birth of the Fatimid Empire.

military camp-city of Kufah some thirty kilometers away. Kufah became the well-spring of Shiʿism and religious radicalism into the 10th century. Hirah eventually disappeared, or rather took on a new identity, as did the Lakhmids. Manichaeans and former Manichaeans, their new identity now became Shiʿites, that is, partisans or supporters of ʿAli (the idea that Shiʿism began in Mecca when the Prophet died because ʿAli was supposed to become Caliph at that moment is a myth). The Caliph ʿAli had turned to them for support against the Umayyads, who were themselves supported by the Christians and former Christians of Syria.

The immediate predecessors of Mukhtar's revolt, the *Tawwabun*, also exhibited a Manichaean trait, in that some four thousand persons without military experience went off in search of apparent martyrdom, as the Rawandiyyah were to do some seventy years later in the presence of Mansur the ʿAbbasid.[7] This march of the *Tawwabun*, the "Repentents," took place in 65/685, when several thousand old men, regretting having betrayed Husayn, ʿAli's son, who was martyred several years earlier, marched out of Kufah, seeking martyrdom for themselves (which they found), crying out *ya latha'arat al-Husayn* – "rise to avenge Husayn's blood." Mani was martyred, and to Manichaeans martyrdom appears to have been a fitting and desirable end to life – *imitatio Manichaei*. This is the beginning of Shiʿism as a religion, the fusion of Islam and Manichaeism.

Mukhtar originated the concept of *badaʿ*, not accepted by Sunni Islam (but accepted in Shiʿism). This is the possibility of changes in the Divine Will. Before one battle he told his followers that God had informed him of their coming victory; when in fact they were defeated, Mukhtar explained that "God's will had changed." The Mukhtariyaah/Kaysaniyyah also pioneered the use of the term *imam* and *imam al-huda* ("leader of guidance or doctrine"). Mukhtar called himself the *Wazir Aal Muhammad* ("the Vizier of the Family of Muhammad"). He transmitted the Mahdi's teachings to the faithful, and received an oath of allegiance, a *bayʿah* on behalf of the Imam.

The large-scale participation of newly converted non-Arab clients, called *mawali* (from which the word *Mulla* comes), and slaves side by

[7] The Rawandiyyah, some six hundred of them, came to the Caliph al-Mansur, demanded that *he give them food and drink*, declared that they knew that he was really God, and proceeded to jump to their deaths from a cupola of a building in the expectation of being reborn in a more fortunate state.

side with Arab tribesmen was innovative and upset some fo the conservative leaders in Kufah. *Taqiyyah*, or systematic deception regarding one's affiliation (widespread in Shiʿism and other dualist religions), which was a fundamental Manichaean technique – Mani said his followers could denounce him under duress with equanimity –, also makes its appearance within Islam with this movement. Mukhtar himself was killed on *14 Ramadan 67*/April 3, 687 in a desperate battle against Musʿab ibn Zubayr.

The organization behind these revolts continued to exist despite their defeats. In 716 a descendant of ʿAli and his son Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah, named Abu Hashim, at that time the senior head of the ʿAlid family, went to the ʿAbbasid homestead of al-Humaymah near the Dead Sea to die, and bequeathed to his cousins, the ʿAbbasids, the *ʿilm*, the secret knowledge of how to deal with this secret organization based in ʿIraq. Abu Hashim's father had been, unbeknownst to the Muslims, and the Umayyads, the clandestine Arab figurehead, the mysterious Imam of the Mukhtariyyah revolt.

The contacts the ʿAbbasids received were in Kufah, ʿIraq, although, as it turned out, the organization also existed in Khorasan as well, such that later writers, like Jahiz, like to call the ʿAbbasids "the Khorasani dynasty." It seems to me that the ʿIraqi component of this revolutionary organization could only have been a Lakhmid network, which survived their conquest by their Arab Muslim brothers from the south, and which sought to reassert itself. The Khorasani component was simply the Iranian branch of the Manichaean family. It is interesting to note that the revolutionaries preferred to use trade names like "saddler," "vinegar-seller," and so forth, to show that they were "from the people." "Tent-maker," or *Khayyam*, was the literary affectation of a later age. Thus the Kaysaniyyah/Mukhtariyyah having abandoned the ʿAlids as non-productive, carried on as the *daʿwah*, or propaganda, and as the revolution of the ʿAbbasids, and ultimately achieved a shared success when the ʿAbbasids defeated the Umayyads and became the supreme power of the Islamic state.

The Barmakid Connection

Along with the ʿIraq and Khorasani connections, the ʿAbbasids came up with another ally: the Barmakid family. The *Aal Barmak* or *al-Baramik*, were a Persian noble family from Balkh. The family supported the

ʿAbbasid rise to power and became powerful government figures, but in 803 they were suddenly deposed and almost destroyed by Harun ar-Rashid.

The name Barmak is a title meaning head priest in Sanskrit (*par mukhi* or *pramukha*, "head of a Buddhist monastery"; the term *mukhi* is still used by Indian Ismaʿilis for a religious functionary). The Barmaki or Barmecides were hereditary priests in a kind of Buddhist monastery in Balkh (today Mazar-I Sharif in Afghanistan), called in Persian *Nawbahar* (*nava vihara*, or "new monastery," in Sanskrit). There they had extensive land holdings and they ran a collective farm of a familiar type on the Silk Road, exploiting the religious initiates. The monastery was destroyed in 663 by the Muslim conquests, and the city of Balkh soon after. The city was rebuilt in 725. Barmak, as the family head was called, set out to investigate the new world order which had come crashing down upon his family business. He visited the Umayyad Caliphal court in Syria, depicting himself as a physician, astrologer, and philosopher from the mysterious East (this may sound familiar as the story of another physician, then from the mysterious West, visiting a Persian king). His sons, Khalid, Sulayman, and al-Hasan, went to Basrah and became clients of the Azd tribe, who had moved from Oman to Basrah at the end of Muʿawiyah's Caliphate, and were also represented in Khorasan.

Khalid ibn Barmak (d. *165*/781) was an architect of the ʿAbbasids revolution and was on very intimate, family-like terms with the first two ʿAbbasid Caliphs, as-Saffah and al-Mansur, the latter of which became the founder of Baghdad.[8] To create a strong alliance the ʿAbbasids and Barmakids had mutually fostered each others' children; the wife of Khalid ibn Barmak nursed the children of Mansur, and Mansur's wife nursed the children of Khalid. He led military expeditions, was governor, and held state office.

His son Yahya ibn Khalid and the latter's two sons Fadl and Jaʿfar became the most famous Barmakids and virtually ran the government during the first seventeen years of Harun ar-Rashid's Caliphate. Yahya had been Harun's tutor and became his protector when Harun's elder

[8] Khalid helped to choose the site and lay out the Round City. His decision to turn Ctesiphon-Seleucia or, as the Arabs called it, al-Madaʾin, into a world capital again under the name of Baghdad may be seen in a new light when the family history is made clear. The name Baghdad was interpreted by Arab historians to mean "Gift of God."

brother, al-Hadi, became Caliph in *169*/785 and tried to eliminate him. Al-Hadi, who swore to follow his father the Caliph Mahdi's advice to root out Manichaeans, had set out to do so when he died *suddenly*. Al-Hadi had thrown Yahya into prison for disloyalty, and the day Yahya was to be executed, al-Hadi died instead – poisoned, people said, by his brother Harun's mother, who was not the mother of al-Hadi. Harun, the new Caliph, made Yahya his Vizier, while Yahya's son Fadl was governor of Tabaristan (Mazandaran) and Azerbaijan, although he had to answer to Harun's mother Khayzuran. Harun called Yahya Barmak "Father"; Fadl ibn Yahya Barmak was his foster or "milk" brother (the Barmaki and ʿAbbasi children were still being suckled by mothers from both families). Jaʿfar Barmak was Harun's boon companion and intimate, and the tutor of Harun's son Maʿmun. Fadl was the tutor of the other son, Amin. A favorable report – one should say "spin" on the part of many figures in the Islamic world at the time and shortly thereafter (due to some special sympathy towards the Barmakids) – depicted the Barmakid epoch as a "golden age."

In 803, returning from a pilgrimage to Mecca, Harun suddenly arrested Yahya Barmak and Fadl and two sons of Fadl, Musa and Muhammad. Jaʿfar was put to death at the age of 37 and his head was impaled on one bridge over the Tigris river, while two parts of his body were placed on either side on two other bridges. Yahya was to die in prison in 805 at the age of 70, and Fadl in 808 at the age of 45. But a brother of Yahya, Muhammad ibn Khalid, was not harmed. Musa (d. 835) and Muhammad, sons of Yahya, were released from prison by Amin when he became Caliph.

The downfall of the Barmakids has been treated as a tragedy and a mystery; it has been speculated that Harun had gone insane. The Barmakids were not, however, what they appeared to be. Baghdad writers from Jahiz to Ibn Qutaybah and al-Asmaʾi noted that, "When in an assembly anything religious is said, the faces of the Barmakids light up; but when a verse from the Koran is quoted in their presence, they tell stories from the *Book of Mazdak*."[9] The *Book of Mazdak* was translated into Arabic by Aban ibn ʿAbd al-Homayd ibn Lahiq ar-Raqqashi (d. 815), himself a protégé of the Barmakids, and considered

[9] Mazdak was a Manichaean or Manichaeanoid who tried to institute a form of communism in Iran in the reign of Kavad (488–531 CE), preceding Anushirwan. In any case, Islamic historians considered him to be Manichaean.

to be Manichaean. Many things of the kind were said about them, and about Khalid as well. They were already accused of disloyalty by the Caliph al-Mahdi and his son al-Hadi. Then Harun, at first on the friendliest of terms with them, suddenly had them imprisoned and torn to pieces. There is a veiled reference to this by the Twelve Imam Shi'i historian Mas'udi when he wrote about the Persian predecessor book to the *Thousand and One Nights*, known as *The Thousand Stories*, which was about Sassanid kings like Khusrow II. Mas'udi has Khusrow discover that his vizier Bakhtakan is a Manichaean, and has him drowned in the Tigris river. An-Nadim, writing a little later, was more explicit in the *Fihrist*: "it is said that all of the members of the Barmak family were *zanadiqah* [crypto-Manichaeans] except for Muhammad ibn Khalid ibn Barmak [the one not arrested by Harun]. It is also said that al-Fadl and his brother al-Hasan were also Manichaeans." This explains why the Barmakids were such successful governors, and also their sudden downfall.

Ibn Khaldun, the father of modern Historiography and Sociology, says that an empire can have only as many provinces as populations with which it has ethnic ties, and the Barmakids had special religious ties with these far-flung provinces of the 'Abbasids empire.[10] The Barmakid "Buddhist" monastery in Balkh was a Manichaean Buddhist monastery. We know that Manichaeism disguised itself as whatever religion was dominant; it can best be understood as an intellectual virus that pretends to be part of the DNA which it infiltrates, and thus, of necessity, it readily mutates in response to new imperatives and takes on numerous disguises. For this reason there is some confusion as to what kind of monastery the Barmakids ran. Writers such as Ibn Khallikan and Ibn Khaldun called Nawbahar a "fire temple" (rather than a Buddhist monastery). Muslim authors tended to lump all Iranian religions together as Magians (*al-Majus*), without bothering to sort them out. Moreover, they confused Zoroastrianism and Manichaeism, which can be seen from al-Tabari's *Book of Empire*, in which he ascribed Zoroastrian ceremonies involving bull's urine to Manichaeans, and the Bema to Zoroastrians.[11] But the Chinese traveler Hsüan Tsang around 632 described Balkh as having orthodox Buddhist monasteries and some peculiar, innovative neo-Buddhist monasteries. The name of the

[10] See Ibn Khaldun, *The Muqadimmah*, Franz Rosenthal, tr. (Princeton, 1958).
[11] See al-Tabari, *The Book of Religion and Empire*, A. Mingana, tr. (Lahore, nd).

Barmakid's monastery, *Nawbahar*, means just that – "new" [Buddhist] monastery – and their family name means [Buddhist] priest.

The name Barmakid later came to be used by many others who were perhaps clients but not directly of the family. There was a neighborhood of Baghdad called the Barmakid quarter. There is a story in the *Thousand and One Nights* about "a Barmecide Feast" where the food is imaginary and invisible. This is doubtless a reference to the Manichaean Bema feast, where the chief guest in whose honor the ceremony is held was for some also imaginary, since he was invisible; but for others, invisible or not, he was absolutely real.

The Barmakids were creating an empire within an empire, and Harun ar-Rashid realized he was in peril. Manichaeans may have brought the ʿAbbasids to power, but thereafter there had been continuous Manichaean inspired revolts in Khorasan from Sindbad to Muqannaʿ, from Babak to the "Red Flag Revolt" (*Surkh-i Alam*) and Mazyar. Also, as Ibn Khaldun said, "The reason for the destruction of the Barmakids was their attempt to gain control over the dynasty and their retention of the tax revenues."[12] Now, important to the events of the year 908, they also created a class of state secretaries loyal to themselves, their protégés and sympathetic to their philosophy. As Brockelmann said, "Manicheanism, particularly in ʿIraq, still exercised a great influence . . . and very nearly became the religion of the educated classes."[13] These secretaries were not to be ousted until the Twelve Imam Shiʿites replaced them with their own people at the time of al-Muqtadir. But Harun ar-Rashid, with the ruthless instinct of the ʿAbbasids, double-crossed the Barmakids first before they could double-cross him, the way the second ʿAbbasids Caliph al-Mansur had done with Abu Muslim, his leading general whom he put to death during a strategic meeting *in one of the villages which constituted pre-Baghdad Ctesipphon* (al-Madaʾin).[14]

The power struggle between Sunnis and non-Islamic elements was also a factor in the succession war between Harun's two sons, the half-brothers al-Amin and al-Maʾmun. Al-Amin was supported by conservative Islamic elements. Al-Maʾmun was supported by Khorasanis,

---

[12] Ibn Khaldun, *The Muqadimmah*, vol. 1, 30.

[13] Brockelmann, *History of the Islamic Peoples* (London, 1948), 112–113.

[14] For the record, Abu'l-Qasim al-Busti, a Zaydi Muʿtazilite circa 1000, wrote in his *Min Kashf Asrar al-Batiniyya wa-Ghawar Madhhabihim* ("Revelation of the Esotericists' Secrets and the Destruction of their Doctrine"), that Barmak was the "ancestor" of the Fatimids. This is not to be taken literally, but in the sense of "Father of" when speaking of vast developments, such as George Washington, Father of his Country.

especially from Balkh. Al-Maʾmun was said to be under the unhealthy influence of an astrologer from Balkh, and although he once led an army against al-Madaʾin which was defended by ʿImran ibn Musa, a grandson of Yahya's, during his war of succession, he nevertheless was to reconcile with the Barmakids and restore the precarious alliance which had, of necessity, to be set aside by Harun and his son al-Amin. Al-Maʾmun was to make Barmakids governors again – in one case a governor of Sind, a region with a very ancient Manichaean population.[15]

It was after the Muʾtazilite concession instituted by al-Maʿmun was brought to an end that the Caliphs had to leave Baghdad for the garrison city of Samarraʾ where, instead of Khorasani Persian troops, they were protected by Turkish slaves.[16] A word about Muʿtazilites: this was a heretical school of Islamic theology which was created by a figure called Wasil ibn Ata. One of its tenets is "a position between two positions." Muʿtazilism is today still the official theology of Twelve Imam Shiʿites. According to the Arab writer and authority al-Jahiz, the Muʿtazilite Wasil ibn Ata was the head of a secret organization with followers virtually in the whole world, for Jahiz said of him: "Beyond the Pass of China, on every frontier to far distant Sus and beyond the Berbers,

---

[15] During the Fatimid empire, Sind spontaneously declared its loyalty to the Fatimids. The Fatimids sent missionaries to Sind from Cairo to "Islamicize" the local religion and bring it in step with themselves. According to S. Stern, the Fatimid theologian, the "Cadi" an-Nuʿman, called the Sind religion "Majusi." Since there is no question of them being Zoroastrians, nor would Hindus suddenly find an affinity for some Islamic-like sect thousands of miles away, this is another example where the word "Majusi," used in the Islamic world, refers to Manichaeans. There is a celebrated story that Bayazid al-Bistami, a Persian "Drunken" Sufi, that is, a Sufi who claimed to be united to God, and himself a converted "Majusi," taught a certain ʿAli Sindi how to perform Islamic ablutions, while ʿAli Sindi taught him "Sufi" mysticism. To explain this strange combination of a Sindi who knew "Islamic" Sufism but did not know how to perform an ablution, that is, to pass himself off as a Muslim, the Islamicist Arberry searched and found a village called "Sind" in Iran. But the Iranian village was not the Sind which acknowledged Fatimid suzerainty, and the contortions of Sufis and Islamicists become clear or unnecessary when one changes the terms of reference. And one of these changes is to recognize that for the Islamic Middle Ages "Majusi" was not a strict designation for Zoroastrian, but was a vague term which could also mean Manichaean. That would make most of the Drunken Sufis recently converted Manichaeans and not recently converted Zoroastrians, which is the usual, and misleading, translation. Needless to say, it will be simple to show that Sufism, especially "drunken" Sufism, is nothing but the shadow of Manichaeism.

[16] Al-Maʿmun made an early heretical theology, Muʿtazilism, initially favored by the ʿAbbasids, the official theology of the empire. There was passionate resistance on the part of orthodox authorities. The decision to make Muʿtazilism official was a concession to the Shiʿites and Manichaeans in the empire. It was rescinded. It is interesting to note that an-Nadim also says that the Caliph al-Maʿmun was himself a Manichaean.

he has preachers. A tyrant's jest, and intriguer's craft, does not break their determination. If he says 'Go' in winter, they obey; in summer they fear not the month of burning heat" (*Bayan* I, 37). What secret organization was this, I wonder? This is surely food for thought.

The Caliphs returned to Baghdad in 892, but by this time they were clients of the newly emerging Twelve Imam Shiʿites, and revolts like that of the Zanj (according to Massignon, the Black Slave revolt was inspired by Manichaeans) and the Qarmatis (according to me, these were Manichaeans themselves) were raging around them rather than in far off Khorasan. Also, unexpectedly, these revolts were soon to be overshadowed by the rise of the Fatimid empire, which was officially founded in that fateful year 909, when ʿUbayd Allah was liberated from Sijilmassa in Morocco by the Berbers of Tunisia, and the next year entered Kairouan.

The Crisis of 908 and the Flight of the Archegos

Back to the year 908. Now the ʿAbbasids were being controlled by a byproduct of the original theological-military establishment which brought them first to power. This byproduct are the Twelve Imam Shiʿites who spin off from the so-called Shiʿite movement. The original partisans saw in ʿAli ibn Abi Talib, the fourth Caliph, the road back to power, and fused the identities of Mani and ʿAli together in order to exploit Muslim upheavals for their own purpose – as viruses use the DNA which they infiltrate to attain their own ends. Around the year 765 the death of Jaʿfar as-Sadiq, the 6th Shiʿite Imam, became the occasion of a split between those who actually believed that the descendants of the 4th Caliph ʿAli have a spiritual authority (who become Twelve Imam Shiʿites), and those for whom this was a fiction to deceive outsiders, and whose real leaders were not descendants of ʿAli at all (who became the Seveners). The latter suddenly revealed a distinctly un-Islamic theology that included, in the early phases around 750, actual gods, like Kuni and Qadar. Thereafter these gods became philosophical constructs as the Seveners evolved into Qarmatis and Ismaʿilis. To be explicit, they were mutating Manichaeans, yet they also were forced ultimately to pretend that their leaders were descendants of ʿAli, which they, of course, were not.

The standard explanation is that the Seveners were "extremists" (*ghulāh*) who attributed divinity to the Imams, while the Twelvers were

non-extremists who do not attribute outright divinity to the Imams, but instead spiritual power to a lesser degree. For them, the Imams are "a little bit divine," if that is possible. After 765 the Seveners and the Twelvers disagreed as to who the Imams were, and as to the nature of the Imams. The Twelvers only accepted relatively Islamic looking formulations and actual historic descent, whereas the Seveners accepted rather un-Islamic and even anti-Islamic formulations. Both ran into problems. The Twelver line came to a halt when the 11th Imam could produce no offspring, and so the 12th Imam had to be invented and spirited off the stage into Neverland. The Seveners discovered that some of their own followers wanted their magical leaders to have official Muhammadan credentials.

After the split between the two Shiʿite branches, the "radical" Seveners and the "reasonable" Twelvers, there was enmity between them, of which the orthodox Sunnis were oblivious, and are oblivious to this day. When the Twelvers became the power behind the imperial throne (the struggle had been brewing for a long time), and put the thirteen-year-old al-Muqtadir on the throne, the state functionaries, a class put into office by the Barmakids and who were themselves crypto-Manichaeans, staged an unsuccessful palace revolt and attempted to put the poet Ibn Muʿtazz on the throne instead.

The attempt to restore the *status quo ante* through the palace imposition of Ibn al-Muʿtazz on the throne was short lived. The day after the child Caliph al-Muqtadir had been deposed, the Shiʿites successfully struck back, and Ibn al-Muʿtazz, "the Caliph for a Day," was executed. Thus the shift of state power into the hands of Twelve Imam Shiʿites was decisive and confirmed. The Twelver Shiʿites, as direct rivals, were more aggressive against Manichaeans than the authentic Sunis had been, and above all the Shiʿites knew who the Manichaeans were when the real Sunnis generally did not have a clue. The Manichaeans who until then chose to be disguised as Sunnis (but thereafter increasingly as Twelve Imam Shiʿites) were now out of power and under serious threat (al-Hallaj had supported Ibn al-Muʿtazz, for example, and al-Hallaj himself was condemned by the "Hidden" Twelfth Imam through an edict issued in 917 by the Imam's "representative" *before* the state court actually condemned him).

This now definitive shift of power would have signaled the time for the Archegos, the head of the Manichaean religion living in the outskirts of Baghdad in the villages that made up old Madaʾin, to depart for safer ground. These events were accompanied by the Qarmati revolt,

the founding of the Fatimid dynasty, and the re-arrest of al-Hallaj in 913 on charges of crypto-Manichaeism and following the "Master of the Sparkling Light." After his first trial, however, the authorities hesitated. Al-Hallaj, according to Massignon, had thousands and thousands of followers or fellow travelers. The authorities kept him in prison for another eight years. A second trial took place before he was finally executed in 922. It should be mentioned that al-Hallaj, like a good Manichaean, had often publicly asked to be martyred. The Archegos would not have waited for that. The abortive coup of 908 was enough of a signal for him to leave. Arrests of "Hallajians" began in 910. As an-Nadim says:

> But [subsequently] the leader sought out anyplace where he could be safe. The last time they [the Manichaeans] appeared was during the days of al-Muqtadir, for [after that] they feared for their lives and clung to Khurasan. Any one of them who remained kept his identity secret as he moved in this region. About five hundred of their men assembled at Samarqand, but when their movement became known, the ruler of Khurasan wished to kill them. But the king of China [an-Nadim means the Uygur Khan, the Idiqut, of Chinese Turkestan, a Manichaean kingdom], who I suppose was the lord of the Tughuzghuz, sent to him, saying, "There are more Msulims in my country than there are people of my faith in your land." He also swore to him that if he [the ruler of Khurasan] should kill one of them [the Manichaeans], he [the king of China] would slaughter the whole community [of Muslims] who were with him, and would also destroy the mosques and appoint spies among the Muslims in the country as a whole, so as to slay them. So the ruler of Khurasan left them alone except for exacting tribute from them. Although they have become few in the Islamic regions, I used to know about three hundred of them in the City of Peace [Baghdad] during the days of Muʿizz ad-Dawlah [946–967]. But at this time [986] there are not five of them in our midst. The people [the Manichaeans], who are called Ajara, are at Rustaq, Samarqand, Sughd, and especially Tunkath [Tashkent].[17]

The execution of al-Hallaj in *312*/922 in Baghdad for *zandaqah* (crypto-Manichaeism) began a wave of persecution in which thousands of those vegetarians that Massignon called "Hallajians" were put to death. This term is peculiar to him since he, a fervent, albeit idiosyncratic Catholic fully aware that Manichaeism is a heresy, refrains from calling his hero a Manichaean. What he calles Hallajians, however, others refer to as

[17] Bayard Dodge, *The Fihrist of al-Nadim* (New York, 1970), 802–803.

Ismaʿilis; al-Hallaj himself was called a Qarmati and Ismaʿili by the police authorities and by many Arab writers, but Massignon insisted that these were absurd, delirious "inventions." By 986, an-Nadim writes, the Manichaeans who had been numerous in Baghdad, were reduced to five. Classical Manichaeism disappeared from the Islamic empire; at the same time a new sect flourished, for a while divided into two groups, Qarmatis and Fatimids. The ones who were willing to make the greatest concessions to Islam, the Fatimids, founded a rival empire, and in 962 they also founded a rival capital to Baghdad, called Cairo, whose full name means "The Victorious City of the Exalter of the Religion of God." The name was propaganda to proclaim the success of their strategy to their kindred sceptics, the Qarmatis. This success, the acquisition of territory and a government, a sort of "Manichaeism in One Country," spreading gradually rather than through world revolution – Bolshevism rather than Trotskyism – reminiscent of an earlier Manichaean schism, convinced the rest that the Fatimids were right, and the Qarmatis eventually re-entered the fold.

AN EXPERIMENT IN DIGITAL RECONSTRUCTION WITH A MANICHAEAN BOOK PAINTING: *THE WORK OF THE RELIGION SCENE* (MIK III 4974 RECTO)

Zsuzsanna Gulácsi
Flagstaff

Digital technology can make an important contribution to art historical studies of severely damaged works of art. In cases where scholarship leads to an understanding of the original iconography, composition, or style, a verbal description of the discoveries may not be enough. A digitally produced illustration can show the research findings effectively. While the resulting computer image could never replace the work of art itself, it can capture a new understanding about the object, and thus increase its relevance as a visual source. Although growing in relevance, so far this new technology has been employed relatively rarely in connection with art history. The reasons are numerous. Art historians dealing with early remains are accustomed to decay. Damage is part of the objects we study. At the same time, the attention of modern art history tends to focus less on the object itself and more on the interpretations of its meaning and context. A further obstacle is hidden in the digital work itself, which requires significant infrastructure, technical know-how,

Northern Arizona University's Intramural Grant Program financed this project during 2005–06. This generous grant allowed me to dedicate a summer for the computer work and cover the significant expenses associated with the digital work and the illustrations of this article – both produced at the Bilby Research Center (Northern Arizona University). I would like to take this opportunity to thank the staff of the Imaging Lab of the Bilby Research Center for contributing the needed technical expertise to this project. On the actual digital reconstruction work, I collaborated with Patrick McDonald and Ryan Belnap (Imaging and Photography), whose creative minds and superb technical skills greatly aided the final result. On the illustration of the current article, I worked with Ronald Redsteer (Illustrations), whose precision and skill was a much needed component in creating images that capture the findings successfully. In addition, this project was aided by the technical advice and supervision of Dan Boone (Imaging, Photography, and Videography), who also helped me with the digital presentation of my talk at the 6th Manichaean studies congress. The writing of this paper took place during the fall of 2006 at the National Humanities Center (Research Triangle Park, North Carolina), where I was a fellow during the 2006–07 academic year.

and is as time-consuming as it is costly. Therefore, it is not surprising that the current art historical literature on digital subjects does not deal with digital reconstructions.[1] Nevertheless, more and more works of art are subjected to virtual makeovers based on art historical research. The best known examples include the faded Mayan murals from the 15th century at Bonampak in Mexico, the digitally reconstructed photographs of which grew out from a National Geographic project (1995);[2] the 3D computer images of the *Byodo-in* Buddhist temple in Japan, which show the original painted decoration of the 950-year old wooden building (2000);[3] and an ongoing project at the Center for the Arts of East Asia (University of Chicago) that set out to reconstruct the Buddhist caves from the Northern Qi Dynasty (550–577 CE) at Xiangtangshan in China, and will show the 3D digital results at an exhibition in the Smart Museum of Art (2008).[4]

This paper is an experiment that combines digital imaging and art historical research. It documents the stages of the computer work and discusses the art historical reasons behind it. Although it would be possible to write solely on the technological side of this project, the goal here is not technical in nature.[5] Instead, my attention remains on recording the process and the reasons that result in a digitally reconstructed work of art.

The reconstruction itself centers on a Manichaean book painting from East Central Asia that dates from ca. the 10th century CE. This small scale image, measuring 6.6 cm in height and 6.1 cm in width, constitutes an intratextual miniature on the recto of a codex folio (MIK III 4974) that belongs to the collection of the *Museum für Indische Kunst*, Berlin (Fig. 1 and Color Plate 1a). The painting is embedded in a clearly legible Middle Persian language benediction on the sacred meal and the leadership of the Manichaean community, written in Manichaean script continuously across the two pages of the folio.[6] Known as the *Work of the Religion Scene*, the image on this paper fragment has been

---

[1] Greenhalgh 2004.
[2] Miller 1995, 50–69.
[3] Tokyo National Museum et al. 2000, 156–61.
[4] http://chronicle.uchicago.edu/050331/shrines.shtml and http://xts.uchicago.edu/introduction/
[5] For a technical discussion of the rebuilding and recreating of images, see Eismann 2006, esp. 236–74.
[6] BeDuhn 2001, 228–30.

discussed in numerous publications with much attention paid to its iconography, which today is well understood.[7] Moreover, it is one of the most important Manichaean paintings in terms of its content. As its formal title indicates, it depicts how the religion works, that is, the ultimate mythological goal of Manichaeism – the liberation of the Light from its earthly mixture with the forces of the Darkness. This complex doctrinal theme is captured in the image. The fruit (considered to be rich in particles of Light) is presented by the laypeople to the elects. The elects consume the fruit and use their bodies to separate the Light from the Darkness. After the meal, their singing of hymns sends the liberated Light up to the heavenly bodies (moon, sun, stars) that function as vessels, ferrying the Light back to its original home, to the Realm of Light, where God dwells. God's hand reaching into the picture symbolizes the completion of the journey. All this, however, remains disguised by a poor state of preservation on a book painting executed in what I call the *West Asian Fully Painted Style of Turfan Manichaean Art*.[8] The surface of the painting seems to be impacted by water damage. While much of the color and all of the gold leaf has disappeared, significant parts of the underdrawing, solid colors, and contour lines have remained intact, allowing us not only to comprehend the image, but also to attempt its digital reconstruction.

Certain Manichaean works of art are ideal subjects for art historically based digital reconstructions. Dating from between the mid-8th and early 11th centuries, they were discovered in the arid regions of the Turfan Oasis (Xinjiang, Northwest China) during the first decade of the 20th century, primarily by German expeditions. The remains were found in distressed states of preservation that seriously disguised the rich artistic and religious data in them. Although they have been recognized as an essential corpus for the study of Medieval Central Asia and the artistic connections between West, South, and East Asia, their damaged condition led to a diminishing art historical interest by the end of the 20th century. So much so that, while Manichaean art

[7] Le Coq 1923, 46–48; Klimkeit 1982, 39; and Gulácsi 2001a, 83–86, the latter published with enlarged color facsimiles of both sides of the folio. For the codicological study of the folio in context of other reconstructible codex fragments, see Gulácsi 2005, 144–146. For an article-length study that explains what is visible from the original iconography of the image in light of the techniques of the Manichaean book painter, see Gulácsi 2001b.

[8] For more on the discussion of this style and its dating, see Gulácsi 2003, 12–19; and Gulácsi 2005, 39–58 and 106–16.

was treated in a long essay with extensive illustrations in the *Encyclopedia of World Art* in 1964, it did not receive an entry in the most recent encyclopedic resource of art history, the *Dictionary of Art*, published in 1996. Today, there are a variety of new methods in the toolbox of art history that allow us to bring out the all but lost data from the Manichaean fragments, and begin their analysis and interpretation. My goal here is to test the possibility of digital reconstruction as such a tool, exploring its limits and potential.

Methodological Considerations

Imagining paintings without damage based on data preserved in them has played a role in Manichaean art studies since its beginnings. Especially one case must be noted here. Writing about the iconography of the Bema ceremony, Jorinde Ebert used a reconstruction drawing of the *Bema Scene* (MIK III 4979 verso) as an illustration for her study in 1994 (Fig. 2).[9] This drawing was the first attempt to show a scholarly notion of what is missing from a Manichaean book painting. In addition to tracing the outlines of the preserved figures, Ebert used broken lines to indicate elements of the iconography that she reconstructed by relying on clues retained in the image and employing replacement motifs from the overall repertoire of Turfan Manichaean art. While Ebert's study did not include a discussion of the reconstruction, the image in itself documents the desire to create a visual record of the knowledge that the researcher has about a damaged work of art. Therefore, Ebert's reconstruction drawing represents a precursor to the digital experiment discussed here.

What makes a damaged work of art suited for digital reconstruction? What art historical issues must be considered in connection with such a process? What basic digital techniques can be used? How does the work proceed? Understandably, the questions are numerous, suggesting that it is important to consider the methodological framework within which this project is realized.

---

[9] Ebert 1994. Bema ceremony that commemorated Mani's death and spiritual ascension is depicted on a full-page book painting, preserved on the verso of a fragmentary codex folio (MIK III 4979). For a color illustration of the image in its actual condition, see Le Coq 1923, Taf. 8b, or Gulácsi 2001a Fig. 32.1.

Rules of Conduct

The art historical aspects of the actual digital work are built on three criteria, each of which capture an essential need for the overall reconstruction project: (1) data-rich starting image, (2) scholarly rationales for the reconstruction process, and (3) resulting image in harmony with the quality of the rest of the corpus.

(1) *The need for a data-rich starting image*. A painting is suitable for reconstruction only if it contains enough clues about its original iconography, composition, and painting style. Unfortunately, we must face the fact that many Manichaean paintings fall beyond this possibility due to their hopeless state of preservation. A significant number of them, however, including the *Work of the Religion Scene*, can be reconstructed.

(2) *The reconstruction must be based on scholarly rationales*. In other words, an art historical reason must be presented to justify every stage of the work. This means that we must refrain from guesswork and inventions. Also, we must refrain from replacing missing lines and motifs (i.e., eyes, hands, faces, folds of garments, gilded surfaces, etc.), in the to-be-restored image by drawing them in ourselves. Instead, we turn to the corpus of Turfan Manichaean art to find replacement lines or motifs, and base their selection on sound arguments. This also means that stylistic and iconographic correlation must form the foundations of digital replacements. By relying on better-preserved Manichaean paintings in matching styles for the replacement motifs, we use the original Manichaean color palate and the original brush strokes of the Manichaean painters.

(3) *The quality of the resulting image must be in harmony with the rest of the corpus*. We set out to create an image that reflects a good state of preservation, as if it was found in a condition similar to other well-preserved examples of Turfan Manichaean works of art; and not as if it was painted yesterday.

Digital Techniques

Starting with a high-resolution digital scan of a color transparency, the reconstruction work is conducted by using *Adobe Photoshop*. This computer program provides a wide repertoire of imaging tools for this project.[10] All in all, the digital work boils down to three essential tasks,

[10] Eismann 2006.

the countless applications of which lead to the restored painting. They include: (1) repairing color and texture, (2) enhancing existing lines, and (3) fitting copied motifs into their new settings.

(1) *Repairing color and texture* starts with taking a sample of an already existing color. Such a sample may come from an intact area of the to-be-restored image or from another, better-preserved scene painted in the very same painting style of Turfan Manichaean art. The thus cloned color carries the texture of the surface it is associated with. The larger the size of the sample, the more of this texture is visible. The application of the sample is challenging, since placing a series of color patches next to one another introduces a repetitive pattern of patches into the newly created surface. This can be avoided by using several samples of different sizes and shapes with diffused edges.

(2) *Enhancing existing lines* involves areas that preserve remnants of the contour lines that the Manichaean artist drew on the surface of the solid colors. These are the lines that capture the facial features, the folds of garments, the fluted bodies of metal vessels, the decorations of carpets and furniture, the contours of hands and faces, etc. Naturally, their thicknesses and colors vary, which can be matched in *Photoshop* easily. The challenge comes from restoring lines with significant missing sections. In such cases, the trajectory, the length, the color, and the thickness of the missing lines are known from what is left of them. Through trial and error, I found that the best way to restore them involves placing a series of dots (matching the color and thickness of the line) along the known trajectory and fusing the dots with the *smudge tool* (Fig. 7b, left image). The result is a line without sharp edges, similar to the penmanship of the Manichaean artist. When too much is missing from a line, this technique cannot be used, since it would require invention. In such cases, it is best to turn to the third technique.

(3) *Fitting copied motifs into their new setting* begins with finding the needed motif on a Turfan Manichaean work of art that was executed in the very same style as the to-be-restored image. Motifs that can be reintroduced to the damaged image through this technique may include small element such as an eyebrow, an eye, a nose, a finger; or a larger element such as a hand, the sleeve of a garment, the folds of white garments that gather at the neckline or at the feet of a kneeling figure, or an entire face. The motif is copied from the source image, and transformed into the needed orientation and size. After the basic fitting is done, the edges of the copied motif must be blended with the new context.

The Stages of the Reconstruction Process

The reconstruction is conducted in stages that target one part of the painting at a time. To facilitate this, the *Work of the Religion Scene* is divided into sections, reflecting the units of the composition established by the Manichaean artist (Fig. 3). On the two sides of an imaginary line that runs across vertically along the right third of the painting (between the elects and the laymen), six visual units can be distinguished: two on the left and four on the right side. In light of their relative height on the picture plane, they are numbered starting from the lower left:

Section 1: Footed Bowl with Figs
Section 2: Laymen Holding Books
Section 3: The Elects
Section 4: Gesturing Left Hand of Elect
Section 5: Vessels of Light
Section 6: Hand of God

In addition to these six sections, we may consider the blue background and the surrounding blank paper surface. The blue background forms an important component of this fully painted scene. Since it covers the entire surface of the image, it is not enumerated in the diagram. Nevertheless, it represents an essential and technically challenging step for the digital work, and thus we may consider it, together with the adjacent blank paper surface, as "Section 7."

Reconstruction of Section 1: Footed Bowl with Figs

The lower left of the image retains remnants of a bowl piled high with fruit (Color Plate 1). This motif is a prominent visual element within the overall composition due to its conspicuous placement. Against the blue background, it is positioned in relative isolation from the rest of the motifs and thus demands the viewer's attention.

Current Condition

Much of the bowl is preserved through its red-violet underdrawing, indicating that its approximate original width and height reached ca. 1.7 cm and ca. 0.9 cm, respectively (Fig. 4a). The underdrawing conveys

the vessel's rounded bottom and its three short legs distributed evenly. A narrow lip surrounds the rim. Due to the perspective employed, the round body is depicted frontally with the horizon (eye level of the viewer) slightly above the rim. Accordingly, the central leg is only partially visible, since it is the furthest away from the viewer. The now blank surface of the outlined object against the background suggests that originally this bowl was gilded.

A red-violet line of the underdrawing also preserves the silhouette of the fruit pile. Although the paper is torn in this area, the trajectory of this line conveys a curve, protruding above the rim of the bowl ca. 0.5 cm. Besides the underdrawing, bits from five pieces of painted fruit can be seen at the lower half of the pile. These pointed pieces of fruit resemble figs captured in pale violet and red pigments contoured in thin black lines. Each measures ca. 0.3 cm in width.

Sources and Techniques of Reconstruction

Numerous Manichaean book paintings contain vessels defined in gold leaf and red outlines that are in relatively good condition (Fig. 4b).[11] Many of them are round and have fluted bodies and three legs. A vessel comparable in shape and size to the to-be-restored footed bowl can be found in the *Bema Scene* (MIK III 4979 verso). The body of the bowl from the *Bema Scene* requires some minor digital touch-up, since portions from its gilding and red decoration have flaked off. This can be reconstructed by first coating its surface with the cloned gold color and then adding the missing red lines onto the gold. Once the body of the *Bema Scene*'s vessel is restored, it can be copied and fitted underneath the rim of the to-be-restored vessel, keeping the shape and the size defined by the underdrawing. The three legs can be dealt with in the same way. The rim, too, requires gold filling and red contour lines, the latter of which is best achieved by distributing a series of red dots and connecting them with the smudge tool.

The reconstruction of the pile of fruit is much aided by the preserved portions of three pieces of fruit seen along the lower right of the

[11] Examples of gold vessels can be seen on six book paintings executed in the *West Asian Fully Painted Style of Turfan Manichaean Art*, including (1) MIK III 4979 recto, (2) MIK III 4979 verso, (3) MIK III 6257 verso, (4) MIK III 4959 recto, (5) MIK III 6258a recto, and (6) MIK III 7283 recto. For illustrations, see Gulácsi 2001a, Figs. 32.1, 32.2, 33.2, 34.2, 35.1, and 48.1, respectively.

pile. After restoring their missing portions, the three figs can be used to create a complete pile. Piles of fruit in metal vessels are frequent in better-preserved examples of Manichaean miniatures, providing us with samples of how to position the individual pieces of fruit within the complete pile.[12] In order to approximate the shape of the pile indicated by the underdrawing, we placed ten fig motifs next to, and on top of one other.

Reconstructed Motif

In its digitally reconstructed condition, this portion of the painting captures a familiar element of iconography and painting style (Fig. 4c). It shows a gold *repoussé* bowl with a fluted body, narrow rim, and three short legs. The bowl is piled high with figs that are arranged on top of one another with their pointed tips upwards. Familiar features of the *Fully Painted West Asian Painting Style of Turfan Manichaean Art* are reflected on the restored bowl and its fruit. On the surface of the gold leaf, the details of the metalwork are defined by the red contours. The fruit is fully painted in violet and red, and its form is further articulated in black contours.

Reconstruction of Section 2: Laymen with Books

The lower right of the painting contains two laymen sitting on their heels holding books in their folded arms (Color Plate 1).[13] The rectangular carpet on which the two men are seated, as well as their identical garments and body positions, define them as one visual unit. The man painted closer to the center seems to be the older and more important of the two. His age is captured in a slightly taller and heavier build. In addition, his position seated closer to the vertical axis signals a higher social standing than that of his companion.

---

[12] Well-preserved examples of piles of fruit are seen on two book paintings executed in the *West Asian Fully Painted Style of Turfan Manichaean Art*, including (1) MIK III 4979 verso and (2) MIK III 6257 verso. For illustrations, see Gulácsi 2001a, Figs. 32.1 and 33.2, respectively.

[13] The depiction of laymen seated on carpets observing a religious ceremony is frequent among the remains of this art. They are found, for example, on the *Sermon Scenes* (MIK III 8259 folio 1 recto) and on the *Musician Scene* (MIK III 6368 verso). For illustrations, see Gulácsi 2001a, Fig. 28.4 and Fig. 40.2.

Current Condition

The carpet and the garments of the figures are the best-preserved elements of this section (Fig. 5a). The rectangular carpet stretches 2.68 cm horizontally and 0.77 cm vertically. The red hem, just as the central area it surrounds, is contoured in black. The men's brownish-colored outfits show recognizable attributes, including long sleeves, round necklines, belts with pointed attachments, and side slits that reveal red-and-white undergarments. Around the upper bodies of the two men, we can see the red-violet lines of the underdrawing, indicating that the bodies were somewhat larger in the planning stage of the image than in the final version. Although the now faded blue background reveals these lines, they were concealed in the finished product.

The heads of the figures and the books are retained mainly through their contours, allowing us to see the shapes and sizes, but only minimal details from the execution.[14] Remnants of the heads measure ca. 0.58 cm and 0.62 cm in width, and ca. 0.84 cm and 0.88 cm in height, respectively. Their features indicate that while both figures had long hair and wore no headgear, the older man had a pointed beard. Almost all of their facial features are gone with the exception of the younger man's eyebrows and eyes, which are partially preserved. The books are captured through their rectangular red borders that reach outside the chest area at the right shoulders. They measure ca. 0.65 cm and 0.70 cm in width and ca. 0.40 cm and 0.50 cm in height, for the inner and outer figures respectively. The uneven edges of the red frame together with the intact brown color of the chest suggest that gold leaf was used to capture the book covers. Small pieces of unevenly cut gold leaf were glued onto the already painted chest area of the figures. Painted onto the unwanted portions of the gold leaf were the straight red edges and black contours. When the painting was damaged the gold leaf disappeared, revealing an area beneath it that was concealed in the original image.

[14] In addition, parts of the underdrawing are visible around the head of the outer layman. Since the heads are outlined in red on all examples of paintings executed in the West Asian Fully Painted Style of Turfan Manichaean Art, the underdrawing and the outline cannot be distinguished in this damaged image.

Sources and Techniques of Reconstruction

A significant portion of this section can be restored through minor touch-ups of the well-preserved areas such as the carpet and the garments. These involve the elimination of discolored patches of the base colors and the evening out of the contour lines. A close-up view of the carpet's now faded brown central area reveals that originally the carpet was painted in green. This is true for both the laymen's and the elects' carpets. Actual traces of the green are preserved in front of the outer elect.[15] Most of the red hem of the carpet, just like the garments of the laymen, is intact. The same is true for the white undergarments visible at the right knees of the figures.

For the interpretation and rebuilding of the heads, we must rely on images of laymen preserved in two paintings (MIK III 8259 folio 1[?] recto and MIK III 4979 verso), since only the forehead and the hairdo of the outer figure can be restored through touch-ups (Fig. 5b, left and middle images).[16] I selected an older face with facial hair for the inner figure, and a younger face without facial hair for the outer one. The correct orientation of the source heads can be reached through mirror inversion. Although both of the source heads have headgear, these can be easily eliminated and replaced by black hair. The intact outlines and underdrawing of the to-be-restored heads define the shape of the needed black hairdos.

For the reconstruction of the books, we must turn to a textile painting (MIK III 6286 side 1[?]), where the folded arms of a female elect hold a codex with a jeweled cover, practically identical to the one alluded to in the to-be-reconstructed image (Fig. 4b, right image). Although the textile painting is in the Chinese Fully-Painted Style of Turfan Manichaean Art, it preserves a book with its gilded cover held in the very same position as that of the red-framed gilded book of the laymen. Our interest is in the central gilded area that is missing from the to-be-restored image. By copying the central gilded part of the book from the textile painting, and fitting it in between the red frames around their gilded centers, we reach a convincing replacement for

[15] The green color of the carpet, preserved in front of the elect, did not provide us with a clean color sample for cloning, and thus a green had to be exported from the green on MIK III 4959 verso. For an illustration, see Gulácsi 2001a, Fig. 34.2.

[16] Although the forehead and the area of the eyes of the outer figure are somewhat preserved, the reconstruction of these lines here would have required much invention. Thus, I decided to use already existing faces for the reconstruction.

this all but lost motif of the painting. To complete the rebuilding of this section, the gold of the book must be harmonized with the gold of the already restored metal vessel. This can be done by cloning the gold color and using it to coat the surface of the book cover beneath the line-drawn decoration.

Reconstructed Section

After reconstruction, this section shows both familiar and new elements of Manichaean iconography (Fig. 5c). The familiar motifs include the use of a carpet, just big enough to fit the seated figures on its surface, and longhaired laymen dressed in local garments with jeweled books in their folded arms. Unlike laymen in all other scenes surviving from Turfan, these figures wear no headgear and they are the ones who hold the books (instead of the elects). Regarding the style of execution, we notice a relatively rich color repertoire that includes black, white, brown, green, red, pink, and gold. As is customary in Manichaean book paintings of this style, all parts of the motifs are fully covered with paint, on the surface of which contour lines surround the silhouettes and define further details when needed. Gilded elements are incorporated by gluing the gold leaf onto the paper surface, surrounding it with paint, and covering its surface with contour lines.

Reconstruction of Section 3: The Elects

Depicted on a scale twice as large as that of the laymen, the two elects dominate the left half of the painting (Color Plate 1).[17] They, too, form a visual unit defined by their red-framed carpet, identical white uniforms and body positions – seated on their heels with their arms folded in front of their straight upper bodies. Their silhouettes, extended by the tall headgear, increase the sense of verticality that governs not just this section, but also the overall composition.

[17] Together with their carpets and the outstretched left arm of the inner elect, the unit of the two measures 5.5 cm in height and 4.64 cm in width from a painting surface that is 6.1 cm × 7.1 cm.

Current Condition

While most of the paint has flaked and/or washed off from the paper, these ghost-like white figures preserve much useful information for the reconstruction. The heads retain data on the sizes and shapes of the headgear (H: ca. 1.1 cm, W: ca. 0.75 cm) and the faces (W: ca. 0.7 cm), and also show traces of the hair along the cheeks and the shoulders (Fig. 6a). The headgear is somewhat unusual in its proportions.[18] Although the rectangular shape does resemble intact headdresses of male elects seen in numerous Manichaean paintings, the excessive height is unique to this image. The garments of the elects survive relatively well (Fig. 7a). They hold significant portions of the white base color, as well as much of the thin black lines that conveyed the folds of these cloaks and the body positions of their wearers. In front of the elects, the area of the paper is torn, leaving us with a partial carpet.

Sources and Techniques of Reconstruction

The headgear, hair, faces, and necks can be reconstructed with the aid of images of male elects from the *Bema Scene* (MIK III 4979 verso), (Fig. 6b). Regarding the headgear, a well-preserved headgear from the *Bema Scene* provides us with a source motif to fit each elect with a headdress that approximates the lost original. The same is true for the faces, hairdos, and necks. For the rebuilding of the two faces, I selected a bearded, more senior face for the more prestigious inner position based on a recurring pattern seen in this style of Turfan Manichaean art, and used a younger male face, one without facial hair, for that of the outer figure.[19] Both faces required minor touch-ups in the area of their hair, where bits from the black paint have flaked off. In order to reach the sizes and shapes needed here, the head motifs had to be reshaped by using Photoshop's *transformation tools*. In full accordance with the shapes of the headgear, the faces in this image were more slender compared

[18] Similarly, somewhat elongated proportions of faces and headgear of elects can be seen on the remnant of an intracolumnar scene preserved on a folio fragment (MIK III 4971a–c recto). For a color illustration, see Le Coq 1923 Taf. 5b/1–3, or Gulácsi 2001, Fig. 49.1.

[19] Senior figures are frequently portrayed with active hands, as seen for example in the *Sermon Scene* (MIK III 8259 folio 1 recto). For the analysis of this composition and its color illustration, see Gulácsi 2001a, No. 28.

to the rounded faces seen on most images that survive from the *West Asian Fully Painted Style of Turfan Manichaean Art*.

The garments of the two elects retain much detail that can form the starting point of the reconstruction in terms of two elements: the lines that capture the folds, and the white that indicates the base color (Fig. 7b). (1) The lines of the garment lend themselves for touch-ups (Fig. 7b, left image). The basic trajectory of the lines is captured with a series of dots in a color cloned from the already existing lines. In return, the dots are connected with the *smudge tool*. The lines at the edges of the garments, however, present a challenge. Since most of the lines are beyond reconstruction, the dotting technique does not work here. To make matters worse, no Manichaean painting preserves an identical view of the seated elects' garments. Instead of inventing this portion of the painting, I turn to the folds that cover the crossed legs of the main elect in the *Bema Scene* (Fig. 7b, right image). While undoubtedly the sitting position in the Bema Scene is not the same, along the left and right sides the folds are close to those of the kneeling elects to be restored. When fitting these well-preserved folds to the least preserved area of the garments to be restored, the result is acceptable. (2) The reconstruction of the white base color of the garments presents yet another challenge. Covering the area with a cloned white color does not work, because it yields an artificial-looking texture. Instead, we experimented with changing the saturation of the already existing white color of the robes and matching it to the saturation of the authentic Manichaean white seen on the headgear. This worked well.

The elects are seated on a rectangular carpet. Traces of the paint surviving in this area of the image confirm that the carpet was identical in its design to that of the laymen. The now missing portion of the carpet can be restored by using the green and red colors already established for the laymen's carpet. Here, too, the red border was outlined in black, while the meeting of the green and white surfaces did not show traces of black outlines.

Reconstructed Section

After reconstruction the two elects emerge with a familiar iconography and painting style (Figs. 6c and 7c). Draped in loosely folding white robes worn over their long white garments, the elects are sitting on their heels, facing slightly to the right side of the painting. Accordingly, their faces

and bodies are shown from a three-quarter view. Characteristically in Manichaean art of this style, the abundant folds of the elects' garments form a dominant part of their depiction. Being just big enough to fit them, the rectangular carpet frames the seated figures as a unit.

Reconstruction of Section 4: Gesturing Hand of the Elect

The elect seated closer to the laymen is the more important of the two, as suggested by his closeness to the vertical axis and his prominently positioned active hand, holding a communicative gesture (Color Plate 1). The elect's left arm reaches to the side, with the elbow lifted away from the body, while the lower arm is kept horizontal. The hand is held straight out with the palm turned upward, while the thumb and index finger touch. Being the only element of the painting that crosses from the left side to the right side of the image, this hand forms a key unit in the communication of the overall message.

Current Condition

Although most of the pigments have flaked off from this area of the painting, the gesturing hand survives in a condition that retains clear clues about the painting technique of the *West Asian Fully Painted Style of Turfan Manichaean Art* (Fig. 8a). Accordingly, we can see remains of the pinkish paint used to fill in the area of the hands and the red outlines that contoured the palm and the fingers. The area of the hand measures 0.65 cm in width and 0.42 cm in height.

Sources and Techniques of Reconstruction

Despite the fact that much of the hand is retained, the reconstruction could not rely on touch-ups for the red contours, because that would have involved an overwhelming amount of invented, modern lines. Thus, I searched for a hand in the corpus of Manichaean paintings that is depicted with an identical gesture. Luckily, there is one fragment (MIK III 4959 recto) with a well-preserved hand that displays the needed pose and is executed in an identical painting style (Fig. 8b). On this fully painted fragment, the left hand of the inner figure shows a gesture identical to that of the to-be-rebuilt hand, with the only exception that

of it being vertical rather than horizontal. After copying the hand, a 90-degee clockwise turn can easily fix this discrepancy. By using the *scale tool* we can size the hand to the needed proportions.

Reconstructed Section

The thus rebuilt gesturing hand of the elect fits the overall painting in terms of its iconography, style, and size, resulting in a good solution for this important section of the image (Fig. 8c). Clearly, a visual emphasis is placed on the hand, as it is placed in relative isolation from the rest of the composition, against the background. The tip of the touching fingers above the flat palm forms an implied triangle that points upward and thereby leads the viewer's attention to the next element of the scene.

Reconstruction of Section 5: Vessels of Light

Above the area of the gesturing hand of the elect, in relative isolation against what originally was a blue background, heavenly bodies occupy the painting (Color Plate 1). These motifs are visible only to the trained eye, even when viewing the original folio in Berlin, or a high quality color reproduction of it on the computer screen. Nevertheless, the remnants of the specific motifs are clearly recognizable here. They indicate a waxing moon crescent, a sun disk, and numerous smaller disks that symbolize smaller bodies of the sky. These now-lost motifs are integral to the message of the overall scene.

Current Condition

This important section of the painting is the least preserved, and therefore a careful observation of the surviving data is necessary (Fig. 9a, left image). Let us consider the faint red-violet lines first. They show a circle, measuring ca. 0.67 cm in diameter, on top of a crescent shape, tilted with its left side lower than the right. The crescent measures ca. 0.68 cm in its width, and ca. 0.16 cm at its middle part. Around the central circle, traces of a series of smaller circles can be made out – two on the right, two below, and one on top. The curves left from these smaller circles allude to a diameter of approximately 0.13 cm for each circle. These red-violet lines are identical to the other

red-violet lines of the painting, confirming that we are dealing with remnants of the underdrawing, representing the original plan for the intended painting.

Across the area of the red-violet lines, paper-colored geometrical shapes can be seen: a triangle, two rectangles crossing one over the other, surrounded by three smaller squares (Fig. 9a, right image). They all are somewhat darker than – and thus are distinguishable from – the much-faded blue background. These blank geometrical shapes, which were never painted blue, reflect the silhouettes of roughly cut gold leaf that originally was glued on top of the underdrawing. Due to the fact that the gold leaf cannot be cut into the exact shape of the motifs, the Manichaean artist used two techniques: linedrawing on the surface of the gold motif (most likely yellow, in this case), and background paint around the gold motif (blue, in this and in most cases). Thus the painter transformed the little squares into stars, the triangle into a moon crescent, and the crossing rectangles into a sun disk. In cases where the gold leaf happens to be smaller than the desired motif (by a few millimeters), the linedrawing continues on the paper surface surrounding the gold leaf, completing the illusion. In cases where the gold leaf and/or the underdrawing is larger than the needed motif, the excess is covered with the blue of the background and will not be visible in the finished image. Most likely due to water damage, the gold leaf had vanished and much of the blue background had washed off in this case, leaving us with this tantalizing section of the painting. While the underdrawing conveys the shapes of the motifs, the now-blank area of the gold leaf indicates their actually rendered sizes, confirming that these motifs were executed in a smaller size than initially planned during the stage of the underdrawing.

Sources and Techniques of Reconstruction

The reconstruction of this section is based on the information provided by the underdrawing, and by well-preserved source motifs. Within the corpus of Turfan Manichaean art, there is a fragment of a pictorial scroll (MIK III 4947 & III 5d) that contains nine intact gold disks (Fig. 9b). It presents not only a suitable source for reconstruction in terms of color and shape, but also a much-needed aid for the interpretation of what is left from the to-be-reconstructed area of the central disk.

The source motif is found on a blue background along the upper right of the overall fragment, directly beneath a gilded decorative

border, and is best interpreted as a sun disk. Attached to the edge of the main disk, there are eight smaller disks distributed evenly. In the to-be-restored image, the smaller disks seem to be paired around the central disk, as indicated by the remnants of the underdrawing seen beneath and to the right of the main disk (Fig. 9a). Therefore, the most likely reading of what is left from the motif is eight small disks placed around the main disk distributed evenly in groups of two: two on the top, two on the bottom, two on the right, and two on the left.

Clues retained on this damaged section of the correspond to the Manichaean repertoire of techniques of execution by which squares of gold leaf are fashioned into disks by line drawing and the blue background. The underdrawing must have been concealed in the original image not only by the gold leaf, but also by some of the blue background. Yellow concentric circles and central dots, similar to the source motif, most likely enhanced the shiny disk surfaces. Accordingly, the moon crescent created from a triangular piece of gold leaf must have been contoured in yellow, too.

In terms of technique, a copy of the source motif's main disk (after minor touch-up to its base color) provides us with the central disk. Using the *transformation tools*, it can be fitted to cover the area designated by the blank background. The very same process can be used for the eight smaller disks, which must be placed in pairs around the main disk. The moon crescent can be made from the gold of the sun disk, and contoured in yellow by using the *cloned hue* of the source disk to create the contour lines with the usual *dotting technique*.

Reconstructed Section

Clustered close to one another, the waxing moon crescent, the sun disk, and the eight smaller disks of stars represent a well-defined unit of this painting (Fig. 9c). In addition to the already bright color of their gold-and-yellow surfaces, it is their value contrast with the background that enhances the brightness of these celestial motifs. The blue background, after it is introduced, will conceal the lines of the underdrawing, which at this stage of the digital work are still visible around the restored motifs, due to the fact that the actual size of the motifs is defined by the gold leaf and not the underdrawing.

Reconstruction of Section 6: God's Hand

Partially outside of the frame established by the blue background, God's hand forms the last visual unit of the composition (Color Plate 1). It is depicted on the largest scale with a gesture that mirrors the elect's left hand. This hand is portrayed with the wrist and parts of the lower arm dressed in a red sleeve. Befitting the highest point on the picture plane, the hand is shown with a low horizon that allows the viewer to see some of the palm.

Current Condition

While much of the detail has washed off, we can make out the red outlines of a once fully painted hand and lower arm. The hand is depicted as a right hand with the thumb and index finger touching, while the rest of the fingers are stretched gently in a natural pose pointing downward in a diagonal angle (Fig. 10a). This hand occupies a sizable area, measuring ca. 2.28 cm in width and 1.62 cm in height, from the latter of which ca. 1.00 cm falls within the frame of the blue background. The upper part of the hand and most of the sleeve are on the originally blank paper surface that formed the margin of the page. Traces of the paint are preserved only from the red sleeve, which retains none of its outline.

This section of the image contains missing pieces of paper. To the left of the hand, the outer margin seems to be cut along a straight line, ca. 4.65 cm long, that roughly corresponds with the upper edge of the originally blue background. In addition, a small piece of paper, ca. 0.30 cm wide and 0.52 cm long, is missing from an area that contained the lower part of the palm. Similarly to the elects' carpet, this part of the image may have become brittle due to the combination of heat and water damage and thus had broken off.

Sources and Techniques of Reconstruction

Neither the hand, nor the arm preserves enough data for touch-ups of their definitions on the computer screen. Therefore, source images are needed for our digital work, including a well-defined hand motif and a red sleeve motif. They both have to derive from book paintings that are executed in the *West Asian Fully Painted Style of Turfan Manichaean Art*.

Gesturing hands are frequently portrayed on images remaining from this style, but none of them happens to show the exact position needed here. A hand closest to the to-be-restored hand is found on the well-preserved matched fragments of a scroll (MIK III 4947 & III 5d), capturing the right hand of the historical Buddha in *vitarka mudra*, from a three-quarter view (Fig. 10b).[20] The *transformation tools* allow us to alter this hand, without drawing any parts of it, and create a convincing hand motif for the role of God's hand. Firstly, the copy of the Buddha's hand has to be scaled to the needed size, turned 90-degrees counter clock wise, and angled slightly to fit the position of God's hand. Secondly, the unit of the touching thumb and index finger has to be moved away from the rest of the hand to match their lower position defined by the retained outlines of God's hand. To accomplish this, the thumb has to be enlarged, while the index finger has to be straightened somewhat, knuckle-by-knuckle, from its original curved pose. Thirdly, the rest of the three fingers have to be moved closer to one another in order to approximate the traces of the outlines of God's hand.

The reconstruction of God's red sleeve is based on the marginal scene of a folio fragment (MIK III 4859 recto), where the left arm of the outer figure contained the needed motif.[21] In this case, the lower arm had to be copied, scaled to size, and flipped both horizontally and vertically in order to approximate the diagonal angle of the to-be-restored arm. The next step requires the change of the source motif's green color first to gray and then to red. The accurate shade is reached by taking a sample of the red paint found in the to-be-reconstructed image along the frames of the carpets and the undergarments of the laymen.

---

[20] The reconstruction of God's hand was the most challenging task in this project. Since this gesture is seen on numerous Manichaean paintings, I anticipated no hardship. To my great surprise, the combination of the hand (right hand vs. left hand) with the angle (horizontal vs. vertical) and the view (frontal vs. three-quarter) results in at least two distinctive depiction types. Type I is the more common. In the to-be-restored image, it is represented by the elect's gesturing hand. Type II is more rare. Its examples include the hand of the Buddha (MIK III 4947 & III 5 d), the hand of an elect in the *Sermon Scene* (MIK III 8259, folio 1 recto), and the remnants of God's hand in the to-be-restored image. For a discussion of the hand motifs depicted in the *West Asian Fully Painted Style of Turfan Manichaean Art*, see Gulácsi 2003, 13 and Fig. 9d; or Gulácsi 2005, 109 and Fig. 4/1d.

[21] For an illustration of the source image see Gulácsi 2001a, Fig. 34.2.

Reconstructed Section

After reconstruction, this section of the painting reveals both familiar and new elements of Turfan Manichaean art (Fig. 10c). While the hand gesture and the sleeve themselves look familiar, in the role of God's hand these motifs are used only in this painting. In terms of style, the fully painted surface of the pinkish hand is contoured in outlines that, due to their larger scale, are thicker than the lines found in the regular size motifs in this art. The same is true for the black contour lines of the red sleeve. Since no comparable scale survives among the miniatures, comparable line thickness is not documented in our sources. Nevertheless, it seems that thicker lines must have been used in order to preserve the proper proportions within the motifs.

Reconstruction of Section 7: Blue Background and Blank Margin

While there are numerous examples of Manichaean images with blank or red-orange backgrounds, the blue background has been associated with Manichaean paintings in the literature of Central Asian art since the beginning of its research. In this case we are dealing with a much-faded remnant of a blue background, the restoration of which turned out to present a unique challenge for digital reconstruction.

Current Condition

The blue background is the most damaged area of the painting (Color Plate 1). No parts have remained intact from the original shade and thickness of the paint. Instead, most of the surface is covered with an extremely light, see-through blue hue, giving the impression that water damage is responsible for its current condition. A few darker shades of the original blue are found along the edges, especially at the lower left. Above the image, most of the area that originally was the outer margin of the folio seems to have been cut away, requiring the reconstruction of the blank paper surface along this area.

Sources and Techniques of Reconstruction

Contrary to our expectations, coating the surface with a cloned shade of the Manichaean blue resulted in a "colorized" look. The image

lost the texture of the painted paper and appeared cartoon-like. Since this method did not produce the needed effect, we began to search for a different technique. After a period of experimentation, we found a solution that yielded a satisfying result. We began by taking a sample of the blue hue from the background of a well-preserved image. We coated the background with this hue by using a see-through effect, without concealing the patchiness of the remaining blue on the paper. The reconstruction of the missing area of the margin was done by cloning not only the paper color, but also the paper texture from the intact area of the page adjacent to the image.

Reconstructed Section

The reconstruction of the paper and background surfaces complete this project. The edges of the blue background, their natural unevenness, along with the surface texture of the blue paint returns. The color contrasts between the blue and the blank paper form a line defined by the edge that creates the illusion of a framed composition. Within the image, the thin black, red, and yellow outlines around the motifs approximate successfully the effect seen on the best-preserved examples of book paintings executed in the *West Asian Fully Painted Style of Turfan Manichaean Art.*

Conclusions

This experiment represents the first attempt to use digital technology as a tool for East Central Asian art history. Based on the art historical research of the corpus of Manichaean art, our goal was to resurrect a poorly preserved book painting and capture its rich visual data in a digitally reconstructed form, as if the image had survived in good condition. By rebuilding its all but lost iconography, composition, and style, we could reveal this book painting, as it really is an important Manichaean visual source surviving from 10th-century Turfan (Color Plates 1a and 1b).

The restored iconography permits us to notice a unique set of motifs familiar to us from West Asian religious art, including figures holding books, a priestly communicative hand gesture, the hand of God in the upper corner, and celestial bodies. These motifs are employed in order to convey an abstract theological theme – *The Work of the Religion* – that

is uniquely Manichaean. Most likely this Turfan image builds on a prototype that originated within the first Manichaean community in late antique Mesopotamia, where Mani (216–276 CE) was credited with the creation of a didactic pictorial scroll, depicting the core teachings of his religion.

In terms of its composition, the newly restored scene allows us to observe an effective way of visual communication. The *informal balance* along the *vertical axis* together with the *hierarchy of scale* skillfully organizes six distinct visual units in relative isolation from one another. They are depicted from *varied perspectives*, which nevertheless correspond with their placement on the *picture plane*. Accordingly, we see God's hand from below, the heavenly bodies from the front, while the gesturing hand of the elect as well as the figures of the elects with the laypeople and the pile of fruit from slightly above. The arrangement of these units in itself constitutes art historical data. It confirms that visual acuity, as a religious didactic tool, was part of Manichaean art during its Turfan era.

The restored style brings out yet another important aspect of the painting that would have remained lost without the digital reconstruction. Fragmentary clues extracted by painstaking analysis of the damaged original with tools of magnification and lighting, are translated into an approximation of the full effect achieved by the painters working in this style. When touch-ups were not sufficient, we relied on carefully selected replacement motifs that were digitally fitted into their new context. As a result, the reconstructed image accords with the original color repertoire and brushstrokes of the Turfan Manichaean artists. The brightly painted and gilded motifs are surrounded by a blue background, similarly to what is seen on the vast majority of book paintings in this corpus executed in the *West Asian Fully Painted Style of Turfan Manichaean Art*.

All in all, I find digital reconstruction to be a useful tool for art historical research as long as the original condition of the work of art is featured together with the virtual image and the steps and rational of the reconstruction process are recorded. While the application of modern imaging technology opens new means for art historians to reflect light onto visual data that otherwise would be lost because of the damaged condition of the sources, it is important to emphasize that their digitally restored versions constitute visual renderings of scholarly interpretations. When used responsibly, this new tool may prove to be especially relevant for the study of the Manichaean corpus, the remains of which have suffered academic neglect due to their poor state of

preservation. The rich data preserved in them can now be brought to light, urging future studies to begin their analysis and interpretation with a commitment to situate these important remains in their broader art historical contexts.

Bibliography

Ebert, Jorinde
1994 Darstellungen der Passion Manis in bekannten und unbekannten Bildfragmenten des Bema-Fests aus der Turfan-Sammlung, *Memoriae Munusculum: Gedenkband für Annemarie v. Gabain*, K. Röhrborn and W. Veenker, eds. (Wiesbaden), 1–28.
Eismann, Katrin with Wayme Palmer
2006 *Photoshop: Restoration and Retouching*, 3rd edition (Berkeley).
Gulácsi, Zsuzsanna
2001a *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections: A Comprehensive Catalogue.* Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum: Series Archaeologica et Iconographica 1 (Turnhout).
2001b Reconstructing Manichaean Book Paintings through the Techniques of Their Makers. *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and Its World*, P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn, eds. (Leiden), 105–127.
2003 Dating the '*Persian*' and Chinese Style Remains of Uygur Manichaean Art: A New Radiocarbon Date and Its Implication to Central Asian Art History, *Arts Asiatiques* 58: 5–33.
2005 *Mediaeval Manichaean Book Art: A Codicological Study of Iranian and Turkic Illuminated Book Fragments from 8th–11th cc. East Central Asia.* Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 57 (Leiden).
Greenhalgh, Michael
2004 Art History, *A Companion to Digital Humanities*, S. Schreibman, R. Siemens, and J. Unsworth, eds. (Malden), 31–45.
Klimkeit, Hans-Joachim
1982 *Manichaean Art and Calligraphy* (Leiden).
Le Coq, Albert von
1923 *Die manichäischen Miniaturen* (Berlin). [repr. Graz, 1973]
Miller, Mary
1995 Maya Masterpiece Revealed at Bonampak. *National Geographic*, February 1995: 50–69.
Tokyo National Museum et al.
2000 *Visions of the Pure Land: The Treasures of Byodo-in Temple* (Tokyo).

THE MANICHAEAN CHURCH BETWEEN EARTH AND PARADISE

Claudia Leurini
Bologna

The Manichaean Church and its structure have always represented a major concern for both antagonists in ancient times and modern scholars. Both the subdivision of the Manichaean community into two sections, Elect and Auditors, and the organization of the highest clerical degrees – twelve Teachers, seventy-two 'Bishops',[1] and three hundred and sixty Presbyters – have attracted the attention and the interest of many over the centuries. The latter scheme has been usually considered as the expression of an adaptation of the Manichaean Church organization to a Christian model, the one Mani surely knew from contemporary communities in Mesopotamia, particularly because of the number of the Teachers (see Augustine, *de haer.* 46). This tradition linking the Manichaean ecclesiastical structure to that of the contemporaneous Christian Church has been kept alive for centuries until the present.[2] On the other hand, regarding the subdivision of the community into two – clerics/Elect and laymen/Auditors with their

---

This contribution derives from research I conducted for my Ph.D., forthcoming as a book under the title *The Manichaean Church. Description of a Religious Institution in Central Asia*.

[1] I use the title 'bishop' here for the second dignity in the Manichaean hierarchy because of need of clarity in the exposition of the facts I wish to bring to the attention of the reader. Although the western tradition (attested in both Manichaean sources and also by adversaries such as Augustine, for example) has actually transmitted the title ἐπίσκοπος/*episcopus* for this degree, the oriental tradition in Middle Persian fragments from Turfan attests ʿspsg/*ispasag*, also testified in Manichaean Chinese and Turkish texts as a loanword. A deep analysis of the Manichaean texts and of the secondary literature about *ispasag* has shown that this title did not mean 'dean/servant', as usually accepted, but it rather hinted at an administrative office of Achaemenid origin still existing also in Parthian and Sasanian times, the one of 'eye of the king', as rightly supposed by Schaeder 1934, 5, although the German scholar just inferred this without possessing any evidences in support of his thesis, evidences we can count on nowadays. For a detailed discussion about this see Leurini, forthcoming.

[2] See Puech 1979, 256–263; Widengren 1961, 100, Koenen 1983, v. Tongerloo 1982; de Menasce 1985; cf. Tongerloo et al. 1991; BeDuhn – Harrison 1997; Sundermann 1997; Lieu 1998.

reciprocal relationships – scholars have taken the structure of the Buddhist communities into account, although a highly probable derivation from the Elchasaite gnostic model is maintained as a very probable component, too.[3]

Moving beyond such suppositions of organizational influence, one may consider possible ideological underpinnings for Manichaean Church structure. Tardieu, for example, maintains that three hundred and sixty, the number of Presbyters in the Manichaean Church, corresponds to the monthly calculation of the movement of the moon multiplied by the twelve solar months during one year; while seventy-two, the number of the Bishops, and twelve, the number of the Teachers, can be considered as corresponding to the number of missionary men Jesus sent out to diffuse his religion in the former case, and to the number of Christ's Apostles in the latter.[4] I find this position by Tardieu both interesting and tantalizing: the reasons given for why Mani chose these three numbers – seemingly from the Christian tradition on the one hand and from astronomy on the other – are actually irreconcilable with each other. Twelve and seventy-two show a completely different origin from three hundred and sixty, although the explanation by the French scholar appears as tenable as any that has been offered.[5] The Christian interpretation does not account for the third numerical entity, while the astronomical one seems to provide no help with at least the number seventy-two. As the Manichaean hierarchy shows a clear pyramidal shape, an attempt to derive all three numbers from the same category would seem to be logically preferable, however. Besides any possible reference to a Christian model inspiring Mani, there were likely also intra-religious reasons bound to his cosmological conception of the world that may justify his choices as far as the clerical structure of his community is concerned. The link with astronomy proposed by Tardieu appears to offer more from an exegetical point of view than

[3] In the Tebessa Codex the binary subdivision of the Manichaean community is bound to the Christian model deriving from the Pauline Letters. See Omont 1918; Alfaric 1920; Merkelbach 1988; Decret 1989; BeDuhn – Harrison 1997. Both Elchasaite (or more generally Gnostic) and Buddhist inspirations are taken into consideration by Tardieu 1981, cf. Tongerloo 1982, Koenen 1983, Sundermann 1997, and Lieu 1998, for example, while a pure Buddhist origin for this dichotomy is maintained by Widengren 1961.

[4] Respectively in Luke 10.1 Syriac and Diatesseron, and Matthew 10.1–2; see Tardieu 1981, 74. This explanation has been supported by van Oort 2002.

[5] See Widengren 1961, 100, who while not pointing to the astronomic pattern behind the number 360 seems to hint at it.

the traditional view presupposing that Mani merely copied Christian organizational models.

The complex sequence of creations and counter-creations reported in the Manichaean mythological cosmogony should not be considered as separated from actual existence in this world. The narration of the cosmogonic events actually represents both the framework in which are inserted the history of this world (birth, life and end) and the explanation of the *ratio* of the world's existence as Light-liberating tool. The universe as Mani figured it out is structured in kingdoms, all depending on the highest divinity in the Manichaean system, the Father of Greatness. His reign is described in the Chinese Hymnscroll[6] as composed of five Greatnesses: 1) the twelve Light-kings; 2) the kingdoms; 3) the wonderful fragrant Air; 4) the Glory and 5) the diamond-hard noble Earth. The same description is found in the Sogdian fragment M 178,[7] except for the missing first and second Greatnesses, thus starting from the third, the Blessed Places, followed by the Pure Air in Paradise as the fourth and by the Light Earth as the fifth. The Realm of Light is also described in the Coptic Psalm-Book,[8] giving an account of the five Greatnesses starting from the Father of Greatness, followed by the twelve Aeons, the Aeons of the Aeons, going through the Living Air until the Land of Light. These three lists coincide, although some sort of discrepancy can be observed in them: the Chinese version did not count the Father among the Greatnesses in Paradise, thus it added the Glory in fourth position, which is not attested in the other texts, which are more ancient than the Chinese one. Thus in the case of the Chinese text we observe a very probable interpolation in the description. In any case, the Realm of Light shows a very 'earthly' structure, as it is provided with sky, earth, mountains, hills, and trees bearing fruits and flowers. It is also inhabited by godly entities and by its king, the Father of Greatness, who wields his power there. It is obviously a separated world, but it is located in a very specific position in the cosmic order, as it stands above all other components of the universe.

Below the Realm of Light, ten Firmaments were organized during the second phase of creation by the Lord of the Seven Climes and the Mother of the Living. Each Firmament was provided with twelve

---

[6] Waldschmidt – Lentz 1933, 485–486.

[7] Henning 1948. The fragment now preserved at the Museum für Indische Kunst in Berlin under the signature MIK III 4990.

[8] Allberry – Ibscher 1938, 9.12 and Wurst 1996, 37, 9.12–15.

Gates plus four for each cardinal point, along with earth and air, as M 178 again testifies.[9] Once more we see a very earthly image of the organization of these Firmaments, analogous to the one of the Realm of Light, where around the Father of Greatness twelve Aeons dwell, three in each of the four directions[10] in a world with wonderful mountains and hills and pure air. Thus one can deduce that the Lord of the Seven Climes and the Mother of the Living shaped the Firmaments on the model of Realm of Light. What is really puzzling as far as the Firmaments are concerned is their number, ten, as numerology in the Manichaean system is never casually introduced. In this case, it must have a precise meaning as well, and I think this number should be linked to the regular recurrence of the number twelve in the Manichaean system.[11] In light of this consistent pattern, however, the scheme of ten Firmaments would seem to lack two units.

The problem might be partially solved on the basis of the above mentioned analogies between the Realm of Light and the Firmaments: the former should be included among the latter and considered as the highest Firmament, thus their number would count eleven units. This solution is still not satisfying from a numerological-symbolic point of view, however, as one Firmament is still missing.[12] But there are many ways allowing us to reconstruct what it is. If the Paradise of the Father of Greatness is taken into consideration, some characteristics can be identified that will help in this reconstruction. First of all, Paradise is a kingdom and a dominion as the seat of the virtue of Kingship. In relation to this we can take into consideration a few Manichaean fragments from Turfan[13] describing an organization of twelve Kingdoms, as

---

[9] M 178 II/r/4–17 in Henning 1948, 311–312 (69–85); 312 and 313.

[10] Widengren 1961, 52.

[11] Gharib 2001.

[12] Panaino 1997, 269 suggests that the Rolling Wheel deployed under the ten Firmaments should be considered as the eleventh one. The Rolling Wheel actually shows a different structure from that of the Firmaments, however. Moreover, while it is the seat of the Sun and the Moon, godly entities charged with lifting up purified Light to Heaven, nonetheless the Zodiac and the Planets, devilish beings, also dwell there. Thus the Rolling Wheel shall be considered as a place of mixture, a tool permitting the movement of planets, Sun and Moon. In contrast, the Firmaments are not mingled with matter and devilish beings, as I will show in this contribution. See also Leurini, forthcoming.

[13] M 14/r/18–28+v/1–25 (Waldschmidt – Lentz 1933, 547 and f.; Boyce 1975, 132; transl. Klimkeit 1989, 118–119); MIK III 4974 (Waldschmidt – Lentz 1933, 558f., Boyce 1975, 133; trans. Klimkeit 1989, 120; M 798a/r/ii–v/ii (Waldschmidt – Lentz 1933, 560 and 598–599, Boyce 1975,134, trans. Klimkeit 1989, 121; M 738

reconstructed by Klimkeit:[14] the Father of Greatness represents in them the virtue of Dominion/Kingship; the Mother of Life is the patron of Wisdom; the First Man (Ohrmizd) of 'Victory' and Salvation; the Five Sons of the First Man of Contentment and Joy; the Friend of the Light is the patron of Zeal; the Great Builder of Truth; The Living Spirit of Faith; The Third Messenger of Patience; The Column of Glory of Righteousness; Jesus the Splendor of Kindness; The Maiden of Light of Harmony and Mildness and finally Vahman, the Great Νοῦς, is the patron of Light.

If, following this list, the Realm of Light of the Father of Greatness should correspond to the first Kingdom, the Firmaments below might be supposed as being as many Kingdoms under the patronage of the remaining divinities listed. Evidence supporting this thesis comes from M 178 again.[15] The Lord of the Seven Climes and the Mother of the Living seated the All-Maker, i.e. the Living Spirit on a throne in the seventh Firmament. The Living Spirit actually corresponds to the seventh Kingdom and is patron of the seventh virtue in the scheme studied by Klimkeit. In accordance with this proposed correspondence, the twelfth Firmament would have Vahman as King, as he is identified with the twelfth dominion in this same scheme. It is well known that Vahman is the protector and supporter of the Manichaean Church;[16] he is called *šahryār ī dēn*, sovereign of the Church.[17] Thus Vahman is sovereign of the twelfth dominion and of the Church, the latter being a Kingdom with Light as its virtue, because the function of the Church is both to free trapped light particles from matter to send them up to heaven and to diffuse the Religion of Light. Thus, if the first and seventh elements of the series God-Kingdom-Virtue correspond to respective Firmaments (Father of Greatness-Paradise-Kingship-First Firmament and Living Spirit-seventh Kingdom-Faith-Seventh Firmament), and an analogous situation of Vahman – twelfth Kingdom – Light can be supposed, then the twelfth Firmament should correspond to the Manichaean Church,

---

(Waldschmidt – Lentz 1933, 561–562 and 599–603; Boyce 1975, 134 and f.; M 37 I (Leurini, forthcoming).

[14] Klimkeit 1993, 77–78. See also Klimkeit 1989, 117.

[15] Henning 1948, 313.

[16] See for example M 729 II/v/ii/12–16: new benediction/and new praise from the sovereign Vahman is invoked on the community. Andreas – Henning 1933, 330–333; Boyce 1975, 149–151; transl. Klimkeit 1989, 139; Leurini, forthcoming.

[17] M 11/r/13–14.Waldschmidt – Lentz 1933, 556–557; Boyce 1975, text cn; transl. Klimkeit 1989, 134; Leurini, forthcoming.

just as all other Firmaments should correspond to the respective twelve divinities, kingdoms, and virtues of the list above. But to maintain that the Manichaean Church should be considered as the twelfth Firmament requires additional evidence.

The ten Firmaments, as they are known from the description in two Sogdian texts,[18] are provided with twelve Gates (*δβar*) plus four, one for each cardinal point, and each of the twelve Gates comprises six Thresholds (*paδīnd*), which makes seventy-two Thresholds altogether: an evident analogy with the numbers characterizing the two highest degrees of the Manichaean Church, i.e. twelve Teachers and seventy-two Bishops. The system of Gates and Thresholds seems to be combined with the movement of the Sun, but the number seventy-two is not so strikingly clear from an astronomical point of view – so much so that scholars have maintained that it might be the result of a mistake. According to the proposed correction, the Thresholds should be considered to number six altogether in each Firmament (rather than seventy-two in each Firmament), representing the position of the Sun during each month of the year; thus the Sun would cross each Threshold twice a year.[19] This position appears to be supported by the contents of fragment M 7981,[20] which expressly hints at six Thresholds altogether. But two questions can be raised at this point: a) why should Firmaments have both Gates and Thresholds if they both corresponded to the months? – a strange kind of superimposition; b) if in the Sogdian fragments the units corresponding to the months are called *δβar*, 'door/gate', why are similar units in the Middle Persian fragment M 7981 called *āstānag*, 'threshold'?

M 7981 contains the description of the movement of the sun across the blue vault, as it goes back and forth. As far as the sky over the earth is concerned, the sun goes across six Thresholds in a movement that starts from the centre of the sky towards one of its extremities, then it comes back to the centre and it moves on to the other extremity of the vault, returning again to the center; thus it moves in four phases altogether, affecting three Thresholds during each phase, which makes twelve. Thus the sky is divided into two, each section being composed of three Thresholds. This particular aspect of the sky has been combined

[18] M 178 II/r/28–31 – II/v/1–9 in Henning 1948, 313; M 548 in Henning 1948, 317.
[19] Panaino 1997; Tubach 1987.
[20] Henning 1932, 188–189; Panaino 1997, 262–263.

with the zodiac by Tubach.[21] The Rolling Wheel/sky, however, is not a part of the Firmament-system; it just hangs from it. It is thus evident that the Thresholds of the sky do not correspond to the Thresholds in the Firmaments, but are rather analogous to the Gates. This terminological confusion has led both the Sogdian scribes and modern scholars afterwards to conflate the Thresholds of the sky with those of the Firmaments, thus causing the Sogdian Fragment M 178 to be considered erroneous. It is actually not, because the Six-Threshold system affects the observable sky, corresponding to the 'Rolling Wheel' described in M 178, where the position of the sun can be observed also in relationship to the zodiacal signs. Thus the system counting six Thresholds altogether has nothing to do with the one of the Firmaments, where each Gate/month comprises six Thresholds.

Now, if we consider the Seventy-Two-Thresholds system as separate and independent from the Six-Thresholds one, then it is necessary to understand what this number seventy-two stands for. The Parthian fragment from Turfan M 183 II/r/2–12+M 3404/r/1–5[22] might be helpful on this question, as it tells about the creation of the sun as a chariot surrounded by five Walls being provided with twelve Doors each. The average time of solar irradiation every day is twelve hours. Thus solar light crosses twelve Doors a day. To go through all five Walls it will need five days of irradiation: $12 \times 5 = 60$. Thus every five days sixty hours of irradiation shall be counted. Each month of thirty days, then, comprises six solar cycles of five days: here we have the six Thresholds contained in each Gate/month reported in the Sogdian fragment M 178. Thus the number seventy-two is linked to the number of solar cycles of five days during twelve months (6×12).

A question remains: why should we count cycles of five days? Apart from the mention of the five Walls corresponding to as many days in the Parthian fragment mentioned above, the Manichaean tradition in the east preserves the teaching of the *panj gāh*[23] of Zoroastrian origin; but it is only tangentially relevant here as it regards only the five intercalary days to be added each year to keep the calendar in balance. It does tell us, however, that the Manichaean community, at least in the Iranian east, had a three-hundred-sixty-day standard year divided into

[21] Tubach 1987.
[22] Sundermann 1973, 63.
[23] About this subject see de Blois 1996 and Boyce 2005.

twelve months of thirty days, to which the five-day *panj gāh* was added to maintain seasonal harmony. We still need to search for a continuous pentadic cyclicity that works within such a calendar. In the *Sermon of the Light-Noûs*[24] we are told about a series of three days and two nights, the former representing the period of the creation of the world by the Living Spirit and the Mother of the Living and the latter the counter-creation of the human being by the dark powers. When at the end of time the Light-Noûs will begin his action of final liberation of the Light, it is reported that the three days will stand up against the two nights and they will overwhelm them and dominate them. The complete story in the Sermon actually tells that the Light-Noûs will substitute all dark creations with their luminous equivalents, thus also the nights shall be substituted by days: here we have the cycle of five days. But those five days pertain to a saved world and not to the current one, which continues to be characterized by the incessant sequence of night and day, light and darkness. This means two things: 1) the Sun with its five Walls is not affected by the sequence day/night as it is already purified; 2) neither is the structure of the Firmaments, as it is founded on five-day cycles, thus once more a piece of evidence confirming the pure, saved, and divine status of the Firmaments.

Now one question still remains open: the number three hundred and sixty characterizing the group of the presbyters. Two possibilities of interpretation are acceptable: 1) it refers to the number of hours of solar irradiation in one month, coming out of the multiplication of the number of hours of solar irradiation during one solar cycle with the number of cycles in one month (60 × 6),[25] this thesis being more strictly bound to the sequence in M 178, which presents some serious exegetical problem exactly at this point;[26] or rather, 2) it refers to the number of days in one year, excluding the intercalary ones necessary to keep the calendar working in the mixed world characterized

[24] Sundermann 1992, 68–69.

[25] Hutter 1992, 63; Panaino 1997, 261–263.

[26] M 178, after describing Gates and Thresholds in each Firmaments, tells that every Threshold contains thirty Bazaars, identified by the Sogdian scribes and the scholars with the days in each month. That is why an error about the number seventy-two of the Thresholds has been maintained. See on this Henning 1948, Tubach 1987, and Panaino 1997. The Sogdian tradition that produced this fragment substituted the number sixty with the number thirty because the structure of the Firmaments was not understood anymore, thus the structure of the sky/Rolling Wheel was superimposed on that of the Firmaments, causing an enormity of difficulties in the interpretation of the text. For a closer analysis of the problems raised by this text see Leurini, forthcoming.

by movement, while the Firmaments, being already perfect and thus fixed with an ever constant period of solar irradiation, do not need such intercalation.

On the basis of these short notes, a correlation between the structure of the Firmaments and that of the Manichaean Church appears at least possible. Under the Chief of the Church stood twelve Teachers, one for every month, and underneath them stood seventy-two Bishops, one for each solar cycle during one year, and below them three hundred and sixty Presbyters, one for each day of the year. I prefer this latter interpretation, as far as the number of Presbyters is concerned, because it fits perfectly with the whole cosmological structure comprising Paradise, Firmaments, and Church. The Church and the Firmaments actually exist because they each play a specific and shared role in the salvation project of the Father of Greatness: they all transmit Light – the former up to Heaven, the latter to enlighten mankind and diffuse the activity of salvation and liberation. Light is diffused upon the mixed world following two ways: its sensible manifestation, solar light, sheds its rays down to the earth through the six Thresholds in the sky, while its metaphysical essence, the Light-Noûς, comes from God and his last emanation, Jesus the Splendor, and is diffused by the Church through twelve Gates/Teachers, seventy-two Thresholds/Bishops and three hundred and sixty Days/Presbyters. Although the Church lives in the mixed world, its members are considered as free from the bonds associated with the materiality of the world, thus they are fit for the diffusion of Light, which, shed by the highest clerics, touches all Elect and gets diffused also among the Auditors. Thus the numerology bound to the structure of the Manichaean Church is no metaphoric one; it is rather cosmologically meant as an actual description of the way down of the Light-Noûς. These numbers, therefore, represent on the one hand phases of the descent of the Light from God to the earth; while on the other hand they represent the ascending Light that, after being collected by the moon from the Church thanks to the daily sacred meal performed by all clerics, is sent during the moon's waning phase to the sun, and is elevated through the Gates and Thresholds of the Firmaments towards the heaven of the Father of Greatness.

Bibliography

Alfaric, P.
1920 Un manuscrit manichéen (le document de Tebessa), *RHLR* 6: 62–98.
Allberry, C. R. C., and H. Ibscher
1938 *A Manichaean Psalm-Book, Part II* (Stuttgart).
Andreas, F. C. and W. B. Henning
1932 Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan I, *SPAW* 10: 173–222.
1933 Mittelpersische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan II, *SPAW*: 292–363.
BeDuhn, J. and G. Harrison
1997 The Tebessa Codex: A Manichaean Treatise on Biblical Exegesis and Church Order, *Emerging from Darkness*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 43, P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn, eds. (Leiden), 33–87.
Boyce, M.
1975 *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian, and Parthian: texts with notes* (Leiden-Téhéran).
2005 Further on the Calendar of Zoroastrian Feasts, *Iran* 43: 1–38.
De Blois, F.
1996 The Persian Calendar, *Iran* 34: 39–54.
De Menasce, J.
1985 Les témoignages des hérésies: leurs ecclésiologie reflet de celle de l'église, *Studia Iranica* 3: 35–39.
Decret, F.
1989 Aspects de l'Église Manichéenne. Remarques sur le Manuscrit de Tébessa, *Signum Pietatis: Festgabe für Cornelius Petrus Mayer OSA zum 65. Geburtstag*, A. Zumkeller, ed. (Würzburg), 121–151.
Gharib, B.
2001 The Importance of Numbers in Manichaean Mythology, *Nāme-ye Irān-e Bāstān* 1: 15–23.
Henning, W. B.
1948 A Sogdian Fragment of the Manichaean Cosmogony, *BSOAS*: 306–318.
Hutter, M.
1992 *Manis Kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte: Edition, Kommentar und literaturgeschichtliche Einordnung der manichäisch-mittelpersischen Handschriften M 98/99 I und M 7980–7984*, Studies in Oriental Religions 21 (Wiesbaden).
Klimkeit, H.-J.
1989 *Hymnen und Gebete der Religion des Lichts. Iranische und türkische liturgische Texte der Manichäer Zentralasiens*, ARWAW 79 (Opladen).
1993 *Gnosis on the Silk Road: Gnostic Texts from Central Asia* (SanFrancisco).
Koenen, L.
1983 Manichäische Mission und Klöster in Ägypten, *Das römisch-byzantinische Ägypten. Akten des Internationalen Symposions 26.–30. September 1978 in Trier*, Aegyptiaca Treverensia 2, G. Grimm, H. Heinen, and E. Winter, eds. (Mainz am Rhein), 93–108.
Leurini, C.
n.d. *The Manichaean Church. Description of an Institution in Central Asia* (forthcoming).
Lieu, S. N. C.
1998 *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 45 (Leiden).
Merkelbach, R.
1988 Der manichäische Codex von Tebessa, *Manichaean Studies; Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism*, P. Bryder, ed. (Lund), 229–264.

Omont, H.
1918 Fragment d'un très ancien manuscit latin provenant de l'Afrique du nord, *CRAIBL* 1918: 241–250.
van Oort, Johannes
2002 Manichäismus, *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Band V (Tübingen), 732–741.
Panaino, A.
1997 Visione della volta celeste e astrologia nel manicheismo, *Atti del Terzo Congresso Internazionale di Studi "Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico", Arcavacata di Rende – Amantea 31 agosto – 5 settembre 1993*, L. Cirillo and A. Van Tongerloo, eds. (Lovanii-Napoli), 249–295.
Puech, H.-C.
1979 *Sur le manichéisme et autres essais* (Paris).
Schaeder, H. H.
1934 *Iranica: 1. Das Auge des Königs; 2. Fu-Lin*, Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse (Berlin).
Sundermann, W.
1973 *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer*, Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des alten Orients 8, Berliner Turfantexte 4 (Berlin).
1992 *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous. Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version*, Berliner Turfantexte 17 (Berlin).
1997 Manichaeism Meets Buddhism: The Problem of Buddhist Influence on Manichaeism, *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ. Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, P. Kieffer-Pulz and J. U. Hartmann, eds. (Swisttal-Odendorf), 647–656.
Tardieu, M.
1981 *Le Manichéisme* (Paris).
van Tongerloo, A.
1982 La structure de la communauté manichéenne dans le Turkestan chinois à la lumière des imprunts moyen-iraniens en ouighur, *Central Asiatic Journal* 26: 262–288.
van Tongerloo, A. and S. Giversen
1991 *Manichaica selecta: studies presented to Professor Julien Ries on the occasion of his seventieth birthday* (Louvain).
Tubach, J.
1987 Spuren des astronomischen Henochbuches bei den Manichäern Mittelasiens, *Nubia et Oriens Christianus. Festschrift für C. Detlef G. Müller zum 60. Geburtstag*, Bibliotheca Nubica 1 (Köln), 73–95.
Waldschmidt, E. and W. Lentz
1933 *Manichäische Dogmatik aus chinesischen und iranischen Texten*, Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Kl. 13 (Berlin).
Widengren, G.
1961 *Mani und der Manichäismus* (Stuttgart).
Wurst, G.
1996 *Liber Psalmorum, Pars II, fasc. 1*, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum. Series Coptica (Turnhout).

MEDIEVAL MANICHAEAN AND NESTORIAN REMAINS IN THE ZAYTON (QUANZHOU) OF MARCO POLO

Samuel N. C. Lieu
Sydney

Quanzhou in the Province of Fujian in South China and its neighboring municipality of Jianjiang became known among Manichaean scholars worldwide through Professor Lin Wushu's efforts to stage there the 2003 International Symposium of Manichaean Studies, "Manichaeism and Ancient China." The choice of the venue underscores the importance of these two municipalities for the history of Manichaeism, which made the subsequent cancellation of the symposium all the more disappointing. The city of Quanzhou was China's major sea-port throughout the European Middle Ages and was host to a number of affluent and influential foreign mercantile communities. It was from Quanzhou that Marco Polo left for Europe *c.* 1292 CE after his long sojourn in China. The nearby municipality of Jinjiang possesses the only Manichaean shrine which is still used as a place of worship with a historic statue of Mani as the Buddha of Light. However, an Australian team under my leadership has been paying regular research visits to both Quanzhou and Jinjiang since 2000 and in this paper I hope to highlight some of the more significant finds relevant to the study of the diffusion of both Manichaeism and Nestorianism (i.e. the Church of the East) in South China.

The Manichaean shrine on Huabiao Hill (Jinjiang)

We know from literary sources that Manichaeism had made its presence felt in the Commandery of Qingyuan (which included the medieval city of Quanzhou) not long after the religion was expelled from the capital cities of Changan and Loyang in the Ninth Century CE (i.e. after 842). Among the fanciful stories collected from the region is the tale of the house of a senior local official in Qingyuan being haunted by an exceptionally pernicious evil spirit. Repeated efforts by Daoist priests to get rid of it only resulted in its being more pugnacious. In

the end a Manichaean priest was asked to stay overnight in the house together with his scriptures and the spirit disappeared for good.[1] The sect continued as a secretive popular Buddhist cult in South China until the conquest of the region by the Mongols in 1277. It is not surprising therefore that the extant Manichaean shrine on Huabiao Hill is linked in the local gazetteer (the *Minshu* of He Qiaoyuan) to the Mongol period of Chinese History (i.e. the Yuan Dynasty, *c.* 1260–1368 CE). The relevant literary source was first noted by the Chinese scholar Chen Yuan in 1921.[2] The significance of this material from the *Minshu* was immediately realized by the French Sinologist Paul Pelliot who translated it into French with accompanying material.[3] The section most relevant to the shrine is as follows:

> The Huabiao Hill of the county of Jinjiang prefecture of Quanzhou is joined to the Lingyuan Hills. Its two peaks stand up like *huabiao* (i.e. twin columns placed at entrance of tombs). On the ridge slope back of the hill is a *cao'an* (lit. thatched nunnery) dating from the Yuan period. There reverence is paid to Buddha Mani. The Buddha Mani has for name "Brilliant Buddha Mo-mo-ni." He came from Sulin (i.e. Assuristan) and is also a Buddha, having the name "Envoy of the Great Light, Complete in Knowledge."…In the period Huichang (841–846) when (Buddhist) monks were suppressed in great numbers, the Religion of Light was included in the suppression. However, a *Hulu fashi*[4] came to Futang (south of Fuzhou), and taught his disciples at Sanshan (in Fuzhou). He came to the prefecture of Quan in his travels and died (there) and was buried at the foot of a mountain to the north of the prefecture. In the period Chidao (995–997) a scholar of Huai'an, Li Dingyu, found an image of the Buddha (Mani) in a soothsayer's shop at the capital; it was sold to

---

[1] The author would wish to acknowledge the financial support from the Australian Research Council and the Chiang Ching Kuo Foundation for International Academic Exchange which enabled him and his Austrlian research 'team-mates' to make regular visits to Quanzhou since 2000.

Taiping kuangji 355.2812, trans. S. N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China* (Tübingen, 1992), 267–68.

[2] Chen Yuan, "Moni jiao ru Zhong-guo kao (A Study of the Introduction of Manichaeism into China)," *Guoxue jikan* (*National Learning Quarterly*) 1/2 (1923): 233–34.

[3] P. Pelliot, "Les traditions manichéennes au Fou-kien," *T'oung Pao* 22 (1934): 193–208.

[4] The term is either an abbreviation of the title for a Manichaean preacher *huluhuan* = Middle Persian *xrwh(x)wn* in which cases it means 'Preacher-Priest' or the *hulu* part could have come from Old Turkish *uluγ* in which cases the title would have simply meant a 'Great' or 'High Priest'. Cf. Takao Moriyasu, "On the Uighur čxšapt ay," *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997*, R. Emmerick et al., eds. (Berlin, 2000), 435–36.

> him for 50,000 cash-pieces, and this his auspicious image was circulated in Fujian. In the reign of Chenzong (998–1022) a Fujian scholar, Lin Shihchang, presented his (i.e. Manichaean) scriptures for safe-keeping to the Official College of Fuzhou. When Taizu of the Ming Dynasty established his rule, he wanted the people to be guided by the Three Religions (i.e. Confucianism, Daoism and Buddhism). He was further displeased by the fact that [the Manichaeans] in the name of their religion (i.e. Ming) usurped the dynastic title. He expelled their followers (from their shrines) and destroyed their shrines.[5] The President of the Board of Finance, Yu Xin, and the president of the Board of Rites, Yang Lung, memorialized the throne to stop (this proscription); and because of this the matter was set aside and dropped. At present those among the people who follow its (Manichaean) practices use formulas of incantation called "The master's prescription," (but) they are not much in evidence. Behind the shrine are the Peak of Ten Thousand Stones, the Jade Spring, the Cloud-Ladder of a Hundred Steps, as well as accounts inscribed on the rocks (by visitors).

Given such a detailed description of its whereabouts, one would expect the shrine to be located almost immediately upon the publication of the studies of Chen Yuan and Paul Pelliot. However, China was embroiled in civil war throughout the 1920's and much of coastal Fujian was occupied by Japanese forces from 1938 to 1945. A group of Chinese scholars from the University of Xiamen tried to locate the building in 1928 but were turned back shortly after leaving the city of Quanzhou because of the presence of armed bandits in the vicinity. The first notice Western scholars received about the successful location of the shrine was the publication of an important work on foreign religious inscriptions (Islamic, Nestorian, Catholic and Manichaean) of the Quanzhou region by a local archaeologist and secondary school teacher in Biology by the name of Wu Wenliang in 1957.[6] A research colleague of his who later became the Professor of Archaeology in the University of Xiamen, Zhuang Weiji, had published a year earlier a very short notice on the successful identification of the site of the Manichaean shrine through what he called "dedicated team effort" and hinted at the possibility of Manichaeism reaching South China by sea as well as by

---

[5] On the Hui-chang suppression of Buddhism see Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire* (see note 2), 234–39.

[6] *Quanzhou zongjiao shike* (*Religious Stone Inscriptions at Quanzhou*), (Beijing, 1957), 44–45 and pls.

land.[7] Zhuang's article is almost completely unobtainable outside China and Wu's monograph became instantly the source of all knowledge on foreign religions in the Quanzhou region.

In his book, Wu Wenliang published a total of three black and white photographs of the shrine which in Chinese is termed a *cao'an* (a thatched nunnery):

(1) Fig. 105: An overall view of the *cao'an* on Huabiao Hill
(2) Fig. 106: Text of a (Manichaean) Inscription on Huabiao Hill
(3) Fig. 107: The statue or image of Mani the Buddha of Light inside the *cao'an*

For the next two decades, as China was caught up in the Cultural Revolution and largely closed to the outside world, these three photographs remained the only published physical evidence of the shrine and there were great fears among 'Western' scholars that the site might have been totally destroyed by rampaging, iconoclastic, Red Guards. However, in 1980, a guide-book to the historical remains and scenic sites of Quanzhou was published in Fuzhou. Thanks to the alertness of one of my then doctoral supervisors at Oxford, Professor Piet Van der Loon, I was able to obtain a copy of this rare publication in a bookshop in London's Chinatown specializing in Chinese language publications. This little volume contains a colour photograph giving a panoramic view of the shrine[8] which greatly reassured me and other scholars outside China that this unique structure had indeed survived the Cultural Revolution and was at last publicly acknowledged as an important part of the region's historical heritage. The photograph also shows clearly that the shrine had an adjacent building which had since then been demolished. The shrine became the subject of a series of articles by our learned colleague and founding member of the International Association of Manichaean Studies, Dr. Peter Bryder of Lund University (Sweden),[9] who was the first 'Western'-trained Manichaean

[7] Zhuang Weiji, "Tan zuijin faxian de Quanzhou Zhong-wai jiaotong de shiji (Discourse on the Most Recently Discovered Evidence on the Relations Between China and the Outside World via Quanzhou)," *Kaogu tongxun* (*Archaeology Newsletter*) 1956, 3, 43–48.

[8] *Quanzhou mingsheng guji – Scenic Spots and Historical Sites in Quanzhou*, compiled by a committee (Fuzhou, 1980), plate between pages 20 and 21.

[9] P. Bryder, "…Where the faint traces of Manichaeism disappear," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 15/1 (1988): 201–08; "Cao'an Revisited," *Manichaica Selecta; Studies presented*

scholar to visit the site and it was in his company that I first set eyes on this historic building in 1990. The first of Bryder's series of articles contains three important photographs of the shrine:

1. (p. 204) Photo of *Cao'an* published in *China Pictorial*, Oct. 1980.
2. (p. 205) *Cao'an* with the new Buddhist temple in front (Photo P. Bryder).
3. (p. 207) The relief of Mani enclosed in a wooden cupboard (Photo P. Bryder).

The first of the three photographs is particularly important because it was taken from below rather than above the shrine and showed that the main building was perched on a cliff-face and that its forecourt is supported by pillars. For the next two decades this view was to some extent obscured by the construction of a large Buddhist temple-complex in front of the shrine and the pillars themselves had been walled to form a lower storey. For the Manichaean scholar the construction of a new Buddhist temple nearby did have the positive effect of compelling archaeologists attached to the local Jinjiang Museum to conduct rescue-excavations at the site between 1979 and 1982. This led to the discovery of one perfectly preserved brown earthen bowl with the inscription "Mingjiao hui (the Society of the Religion of Light)" as well as hundreds of fragments from similar bowls from the area in front of the shrine near to where the Buddhist temple would later be built. The term "the Religion of Light" is the official title of Manichaeism in South China and the bowls were probably used for the eating of vegetarian meals by members of the sect during the Song Dynasty. The Buddhist temple-complex totally obscured the shrine because of its size and proximity. The good news for Manichaean scholars is that this Buddhist temple-complex in front of the Manichaean shrine was totally demolished in 2004 and has since then been rebuilt on the top of Huabiao Hill – making way for what strikes me and my colleagues as a projected "Mani Theme Park" surrounded by a recently built wall with freshly laid landscape gardens. Already a new Mani-statue with

---

to Professor Julien Ries on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, Manichaean Studies I, A. Van Tongerloo and S. Giversen, eds. (Louvain–Lund, 1991), 35–42; and "Manichaeism as a Link Between the Silk Roads on Land and Sea," *Zhongguo yu haishang sichou zhi lu – China and the Maritime Silk Route*, UNESCO Quanzhou International Seminar on China and the Maritime Silk Route, II (Fujian, 1994), 63–69.

strong Daoist influence in its depiction of the prophet had been added to the area of the demolished wing of the shrine. In due course tour guides would undoubtedly try to convince unsuspecting tourists that this Daoist image of Mani is as old as the image inside the shrine. The site is now regularly visited by large numbers of overseas Chinese visitors-cum-worshippers as well as by UNESCO dignitaries.

Quanzhou (Zayton) shot to international fame (or notoriety) with the publication in 1997 of the account of the sojourn of an Italian Jewish merchant, Jacob of Ancona, at the port-city, *c.* 1271–72. The work *The City of Light* was quickly labeled a forgery or literary hoax by critically-minded scholars who had noted a large number of anachronisms in the translated text – especially the use of terms and place-names closely linked with the Mongol occupation of the region which took place a few years after the departure of Jacob in 1272.[10] Moreover, the book gives only an English translation of a closely guarded manuscript in Franco-Italian and the translator, David Selbourne, has consistently refused to provide any photographic images of the original text – not even a transcription of select portions in the original language. The work, however, contains a great deal of little known but locally verifiable historical details about Quanzhou in the last years of the Southern Song Dynasty (1225–1280 CE) – including the presence of Nestorians in the city, a fact which is known only to a small handful of specialists.[11] Many Quanzhou-based Chinese scholars therefore were impelled to defend the authenticity of a document which, if proved genuine, could equal the *Il Milione* of Marco Polo in importance. This local riposte to international critical denunciation culminated in the publication (with support from UNESCO) of the first substantial work on the historical sites of Quanzhou and its environs in Chinese with good parallel translation in English. The work also meets international publishing standards, in the quality of the color photographs it reproduces. The picture of the Manichaean shrine it contains shows clearly how it was overshadowed by the Buddhist temple-complex built after the end of the Cultural Revolution. The book contains also a stunning photograph

[10] [Jacob D'Ancona] *The City of Light*, translated and edited by D. Selbourne (London, 1997).

[11] *Ibid*. 110–11 and 113, which interestingly calls the Nestorians '*elicoveni*' the Italianized (?) version of the official title of Nestorians in Chinese transliteration '*Yelikewen*' introduced after (!) and not before 1277.

of the famous statue of Mani as the Buddha of Light inside the shrine. It was taken with the correct amount of artificial lighting by a professional photographer and the protective wood and glass structure which normally houses the statue was removed specially for the photographer. The book, *Return to the City of Light*,[12] was in considerable demand by scholars involved in the on-going debate over the authenticity of the *itinerarium* of Jacob of Ancona and went out of print within two years of publication. The Australian team will negotiate with the relevant authorities in Quanzhou for the right to reproduce this outstanding photograph of the statue in their final report on the *cao'an* for publication in the Series Archaeologica of the *Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum*.

According to He Qiaoyuan's statement translated above, the *cao'an* on Huabiao Hill was converted to the worship of Mani during the period of Mongol rule which in this region would have run from 1277 to *c.* 1368 CE. According to local records, the extant statue of Mani inside the shrine was carved in 1339 CE, but it was probably based on an earlier image which had deteriorated with age. However, the excavations carried out in the area surrounding the shrine appear to suggest that the site was already a significant religious centre under the Northern and Southern Song Dynasties (960–1280 CE) and the earliest building may even go back to the Late Tang period, i.e. shortly after the arrival of the first missionary taking refuge from the persecution of the religion in the capital cities (after 842 CE). In fact, on Taimu Hill in the north of Fujian Province there is a very small rustic Manichaean shrine of very great antiquity, but now without its Mani-statue, which Ralph Kauz successfully located and on which he reported at the Fourth International Conference on Manichaeism in Berlin in 1997.[13] The future visitor to the *cao'an* on Huabiao Hill in Jinjiang will undoubtedly be given the impression by local guides that this unique Manichaean building is an ancient building and the only one in the world which is still an active place of worship. However, the word '*gu*' in Chinese means both 'ancient' and 'old'. It soon became obvious to the Australian team that the shrine is an 'old' rather than an 'ancient' building because of the large amount of modern building material

---

[12] Wang Lianmao, ed., *Return to the City of Light – Quanzhou: An Eastern City Shining with Splendour of Medieval Culture* (Fujian, 2000), 129 (shrine) and 130 (statue).

[13] R. Kauz, "Der 'Mo-ni-gong' – ein zweiter erhaltener manichäischer Tempel in Fujian?" *Studia Manichaica*, 334–45.

used in its construction, and because its architectural style is typical of the so-called Southern Style with its typical 'swallow-tail' rafters which flourished in Fujian Province in the Late Imperial and Early Modern periods (i.e., mid-eighteenth to early twentieth century).[14] Close inspection of the building inscriptions in Chinese reveals that the shrine had undergone a major program of rebuilding and refurbishment between 1923 and 1932 just before it was identified as a Manichaean shrine by Chinese and European scholars.[15] According to local records, both written and oral, the building was left in ruins by forces of the ruling Manchu (Qing) Dynasty who fought in the vicinity with local nationalist "rebel" forces led by the legendary Coxinga (Zheng Chenggong) who became famous for driving out the Dutch settlers from nearby island of Taiwan (Formosa) in 1662 CE. At the beginning of the last century, a Buddhist monk took up residence in the ruins and established a popular Buddhist cult based on the statue of Mani the Buddha of Light which had survived the pillaging. The cult, which has no discernible intellectual links with Manichaeism, was a great success with inhabitants of the local villagers, and it was largely through the personal effort of this Buddhist monk that sufficient funds were raised to repair, rebuild, and refurbish the entire shrine between 1923 and 1932 in the Southern Architectural Style. The Manichaean origins of the site was probably not known to the worshippers until Wu Wenliang and his colleagues had successfully located it in the early 1950's and identified it as the *cao'an* detailed in the *Minshu* of He Qiaoyuan. Its relation to the most famous and most severely persecuted heresy in the Christian world is still probably obscure to most local worshippers who could not but be impressed by the number of foreign scholars interested in their local shrine. A drawing of Mani the Buddha of Light based on the statue now heads the pantheon of local deities in a village shrine within walking distance to the *cao'an* and what we may be witnessing is what I have termed the beginnings of a "UNESCO-Cargo Cult."

The *cao'an* consists of a small main hall large enough to accommodate about a dozen worshippers (or visitors) (see Pl. 1), measuring 6.08 meters deep and 7.5 meters in length, with a doorway 2.75 meters

---

[14] *Quanzhoushi jianzhu ji* (*An Architectural History of Quanzhou*) (Quanzhou, 1995), 140–72.

[15] For a less thoroughly modernized and probably more "ancient" Manichaean shrine in Fujian see the aforementioned shrine on Taimu Hill reported by R. Kauz, "Der 'Mo-ni-gong,'" esp. Fig. 1 on 335.

wide, and the height of the building from the eaves to ground level approximating 13 meters. All other adjacent buildings were added in recent times. The statue of Mani the Buddha of Light which is carved into the cliff-face which forms the rear wall is 1.54 meters tall and 0.85 meter wide and 0.11 meter deep. The head of the statue is 0.32 meter long and 0.25 meter deep (see Pl. 2). Behind the statue is a radiant nimbus-halo 1.7 meters in diameter. It is this halo or aureole with streaks in red and white which gives the statue its famed luminescent appearance.[16] More than one scholar has noted that the visage of the statue is different from that of the Buddha as normally depicted in statues or paintings in the Far East. The cheeks of the Mani-figure are fleshy and his eyebrows are raised. He is also bearded and his lips are exceptionally thin. The statue was said to have originally possessed a beard or side-burns, but these had been knocked off by a zealous Buddhist monk over half a century ago to make the statue more "Buddha-like." Had he not done so, the face of the Mani-stature would have more closely resembled the one known image of him preserved on a seal[17] and also very probably on a temple-banner (MIK III 6286 side 2[?]),[18] both from Central Asia. Bryder is correct in labeling the facial features of the Mani-figure as "Westasian type."[19] Bryder has also noted similarities in the garment worn by the statue with that of the Manichaean *archēgos* in the famous wall-painting from Chotscho once exhibited in Berlin and now lost because of Allied bombing, especially in the striking double 'butterfly'-knots.[20] This may explain why the Manichaeans in South China were nicknamed the "Followers of Two Knots."[21] Also worth noting is that the sleeves of the garment depicted on the Mani

---

[16] Lin Wenming, "Moni jiao he Cao'an yiji (Historical Remains of Manichaeism and Cao'an)" *Haijiao shi yanjiu* (*Research into China's Overseas Communication History*) 1978, 1, 38.

[17] W. Sundermann, "Ein übersehenes Bild Manis," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 12 (1985): 172–74.

[18] Cf. Zs. Gulácsi, *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections*, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Archaeologica et Iconographica 1 (Turnhout, 2001), 180. My identification of the central seated figure on the top of the banner as Mani is based on the fact that the reverse of the banner shows a depiction of Buddha in the same position. It is interesting that the Mani-figure was robed in red and not white. I am grateful to Dr. Lore Sander for drawing my attention to this representation in the Museum für Indische Kunst during the International Association of Manichaean Studies' Fourth International Conference in Berlin in 1997.

[19] Bryder, "…Where the faint traces," 205.

[20] Bryder, "…Where the faint traces," 205.

[21] Cf. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman* Empire, 287.

statue exhibit distinctive squares which might, as Dr. Jorinde Ebert has shown in her important contribution to the study of the Late Roman influence on garments in Manichaean figural representations, have originally been official badges of rank (*segmenta*).[22]

In front of the shrine there was once an inscription of sixteen Chinese characters on a large natural rock in four rows. In translation they read:

> (You are) implored to recite: Purity, Light, Great Power, Wisdom, the highest and unsurpassable truth, Mani the Buddha of Light. Inscribed in the ninth month of the Jichou year of the Zhengtung period (i.e. 1445 CE).[23]

The inscription puts beyond doubt the Manichaean identity of the shrine, as the tetrad of divine qualities the worshipper was implored to memorize or recite are those of the Father of Greatness who heads the Manichaean pantheon, with 'Divinity' translated as 'Purity' which is quite common in the translation of foreign religious terms into Chinese. Sadly this inscribed rock was destroyed during the Cultural Revolution and the same inscription now replicated on the cliff-face to the side of the shrine is a well-meaning but a-historical replacement.

The Nestorian and Catholic Remains

Wu Wenliang who first reported on the Manichaean shrine near Jinjiang was also a pioneering scholar in the study of Medieval Christian (both Nestorian and Catholic) remains in Quanzhou. The presence in Quanzhou of what appears to be grave-stones decorated with the typically Nestorian 'Cross-on-Lotus' symbol embedded either in its medieval walls or used as rockery in gardens was reported by Catholic missionaries as early as the first half of the seventeenth century. They also noted the similarity in their design with the symbol on top of the famous Nestorian stele from Xi'anfu found between 1623 and 1625. More significant is the discovery in the early part of the Twentieth

---

[22] J. Ebert, "Segmentum and Clavus in Manichaean Garments of the Turfan Oasis," *Turfan Revisited: The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*, D. Durkin-Meisterernst et al., eds. (Berlin, 2004), 72–83.

[23] Wu Wenliang, *Quanzhou*, 44, trans. S. N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China* (Leiden, 1998), 190.

Century of a finely carved headstone with an angelic figure with four wings holding in his lap the 'Cross-on-Lotus' symbol. A poor quality photograph of this stone taken by G. Arnaiz was published by Arthur Moule in his major study on Christianity in China in the pre-Modern Era.[24] The stone, which many thought had disappeared, was tracked down by the art historian Gustave Ecke to the Daoist (?) Zoukui Gong in Quanzhou in 1927 and a superior photograph was duly published by him in 1935.[25] However, because the book in which it was published is devoted to the art of the Buddhist Kaiyuan Temple in Quanzhou famous for its 'Twin-Pagodas', the existence of this important photograph is known to few scholars of Nestorian Christianity in China. It was correctly suggested by Moule and other scholars that the most likely date for these Christian relics would have been the mid-late Yuan Dynasty (i.e. *c.* 1295–*c.* 1360) viz. the half-century after Marco Polo's visit to the region when many foreigners, including Franciscan missionaries, were known to have been active in the city under Mongol rule.[26] About the same time as Ecke's visit to Quanzhou, the local authorities ordered the partial demolition of the city's medieval walls to make way for the construction of a railway line. The walls were later completely demolished during the Sino-Japanese Conflict when the order was given to deny their use by the advancing Japanese army against planned counter-attacks by Chinese guerilla forces. A large number of tombstones with unmistakably Christian symbols and some with inscriptions in a variety of scripts (Syriac, Mongol, Chinese, and even one in Latin) were unearthed. Wu Wenliang dedicated himself tirelessly to rescuing many of these precious stones and stored them in his backyard which became a veritable *beilin* (forest of inscribed stelae). This material would later form the core of the collection now housed in a special wing of the Quanzhou Maritime Museum built in 1990.

Wu published his major study on foreign religious inscriptions in Quanzhou in 1957, and included in it are photographs and brief descriptions of some thirty of these Christian tombstones, the majority

---

[24] A. C. Moule, *Christians in China before the Year 1550* (London, 1930), fig. 11, facing 80.

[25] G. Ecke and P. Demiéville, *The Twin Pagodas of Zayton – A Study of Later Buddhist Sculpture in China*, Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph Series 2 (Cambridge, Mass., 1935), 22 and pl. 70b.

[26] For an up-to-date general study of Christianity in China under the Mongols see N. Standaert, ed., *Handbook of Christianity in China Vol. 1 (635–1800)*, (Leiden, 2001), 43–111. See also Moule, *Christians in China*, 78–264.

of which are almost certainly Nestorian.[27] Aware that this important material is almost completely unknown to Western scholars, Wu had earlier sent via a friend a selection of black and white photographs to John Foster, a noted scholar of Nestorian Christianity in China then based in England. Foster realized immediately the importance and uniqueness of this material and with the help of learned colleagues published a seminal article based entirely on the photographs even though he had never set eyes on the original stones himself.[28] Several of the stones had elaborate 'Cross-on-Lotus' designs flanked by Christian angels with striking resemblances to Buddhist *apsaras*.[29] Two of these also had long inscriptions in the Syriac script.[30] A major contribution of Foster is his recognition of the inscription in Roman script as that of the Franciscan missionary Andrea of Perugia who came to the Quanzhou (Zayton in Latin) as part of the papal mission led by John of Montecorvino *c.* 1294 and who was also the third Catholic bishop of the city. Foster's transcription of this very worn inscription remains standard:[31]

† Hic (in PFS) sepultus est
Andreas Perusinus (de-
votus ep. Cayton.....
.....ordinis (fratrum
min.).....
...(Jesus Christi) Apostolus
.....
.....(in mense).....
M (cccxx)xii +

Wu Wenliang died in 1967 – a victim of the Cultural Revolution – but his important work was continued by his son Wu Yuxiong. The latter has published in Chinese a steady stream of learned articles and

[27] Wu Wenliang, *Quanzhou*, 28–43 and 46–7, and figs 71–101, and suppl. figs 8 and 17–19.

[28] J. Foster, "Crosses from the walls of Zaitun," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, n. s. 1954, 1–25 with 17 pls.

[29] Wu Wenliang, *Quanzhou*, figs 78.2, 80 and suppl. fig. 8. Cf. Foster, "Crosses from the walls of Zaitun," pls XI and XVII. See also 20–22.

[30] Wu Wenliang, *Quanzhou*, figs 78.2 and 79. Cf. Foster, "Crosses from the walls of Zaitun," pls XV and XVI.

[31] Foster, "Crosses from the walls of Zaitun," 19. The transcription was the work of Professor C. J. Fordyce.

the occasional monograph updating his father's work. A revised and expanded version of Wu Wenliang's 1957 monograph-catalogue was completed by his son Wu Youxiong in 2005.[32] The majority of the new finds are now housed in the UNESCO-sponsored Quanzhou Maritime Museum, but Wu Wenliang had earlier deposited some of the material in the Museum of the Department of Anthropology at Xiamen University. In the last few years, UNESCO funding had enabled two new museums to be established in the Quanzhou region, the Jinjiang Municipal Museum and the Quanzhou City Museum. The former now holds the bowls recovered from the site of the Manichaean shrine and the latter houses Nestorian material discovered in the last few years. A handful of Nestorian tombstones had also been deposited in the Fujian Provincial Museum in Fuzhou. Associate Professor Iain Gardner and Dr. Kenneth Parry of the Australian team have begun a consolidated catalogue of all Manichaean, Nestorian and Catholic material from the Quanzhou region exhibited in the six museums and so far more than sixty items (i.e., double the number listed by Wu Wenliang) had been catalogued and digitally photographed. Examination of published and unpublished photographs of the various items taken over a period of years has led to a number of startling or unsettling discoveries. The most significant of these concerns the image of the angel with four wings photographed by Ecke in 1927. The angel-figure given in the photographs bears a striking non-resemblance to the stone with the same description now on display in the Quanzhou Maritime Museum. We owe it to Director Wang Lianmao for the sad tale that the stone photographed by Ecke was saved from the ravages of the Cultural Revolution only for it to be damaged beyond repair when the collection was taken out of storage. What is now a centerpiece of the exhibition in fact is a replica and this is not explained in the official description of the object in either English or Chinese. Fortunately another headstone with a four-winged angel was discovered in 1975 and acquired by the Museum in 1988. This has an intriguing hollow design above the head of the angel. It has been suggested that it is a representation of Buddhist Nirvana which could be interpreted as nothingness. However, it will be difficult to imagine that the Nestorian Christians in Quanzhou preached a nihilistic afterlife!

[32] Wu Wenliang, *Quanzhou zongjiao shike (Religious Stone inscriptions at Quanzhou), revised and expanded edition by Wu Youxiong* (Beijing, 2005). This work appeared too late to be of use to the preparation of this study.

A tombstone of considerable importance to the study of Manichaeism is that of the Nestorian bishop Mar Solomon who died in 1313 CE. His funerary inscription is bilingual: Chinese and Syro-Turkic – the latter is Eastern Turkic written in the Syriac script with frequent use of Syriac loanwords. I have published a translation of the Chinese version as early as 1980,[33] with subsequent revisions in 1992[34] and 1998.[35] The following is yet another revised version translated in collaboration with my colleague Dr. Lance Eccles:[36]

> {Line 1} To the Administrator of the Manichaeans (*Mingjiao*) and Nestorians (*Qinjiao*) etc. in the combined Circuits of Jiangnan, the Most Reverend (*Mali Haxiya*) Christian (*Yelikewen*) Bishop (*abisiguba*) Mar Solomon (*Mali Shilimen*), Timothy Sauma (*Tiemida Saoma*) and others have mournfully and respectfully dedicated this tombstone {Line 2} in the second year of Huangqing, *guichou*, on the fifteenth day of the eighth month (5th September, 1313).

The Syro-Turkic version is neither a translation of the Chinese nor is it the original for the latter. It is very brief and the much longer Chinese version is therefore of very limited help in deciphering its more difficult Syro-Turkic counterpart. This can tentatively be translated as follows:

> This is the tomb of the Most Reverend Bishop Mar Solomon of the Circuits (lit. realms) of Manzi (i.e. South China). Zauma (= Syr. Sauma), the administrator leading [the mourners (?)…], wrote this on the fifteenth day of the eighth month of the Ox year.

The very first word of the Syro-Turkic has proved problematic to scholars who have attempted to transcribe and translate this version of the inscription. The first Altaicist to tackle it, the late Murayama, read *mahi ail-lar-nïng* and translated it in German as "Religionsbezirke(?)."[37] His reading and interpretation has been accepted by a number of

---

[33] S. N. C. Lieu, "Nestorians and Manichaeans on the South China Coast," *Vigilae Christianae* 34 (1980): 73.

[34] *Idem*, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire* (see note 2), 297.

[35] *Idem*, *Manichaeism in Central Asia* (see note 24), 180.

[36] Texts and translations from L. Eccles, M. Franzmann and S. N. C. Lieu, "Observations on Select Christian Inscriptions in the Syriac Script from Zayton," *Silk Road Studies X – From Palmyra to Zayton: Epigraphy and Iconography*, I. Gardner, S. Lieu, and K. Parry, eds. (Turnhout, 2005), 265. The present translation includes some revision made in 2008.

[37] S. Murayama, "Eine nestorianische Grabinschrift in türkischer Sprache aus Zaiton," *Ural-altaistische Jahrbücher* 35 (1969): 394.

scholars. Professor Niu Ruji, a noted scholar in the study of Nestorian Syro-Turkic inscriptions found in Central Asia and China, has recently suggested translating this unusual term as "of the Clan of Mahe."[38] However, such an interpretation bears no relationship to the obviously relevant information provided by the Chinese version of this bilingual funerary inscription. Our reading of this problematic first word *m(a)nzi illär-ning*, meaning "the Circuits (or Districts) of Manzi" is the result of international team-work. My Macquarie colleague and fellow team member, Dr. Lance Eccles, drew my attention to the fact that the arch-diocese of the deceased Mar Solomon is designated in Chinese as "the various circuits of Jiangnan" (i.e., the region south of the Yangtze), and the plural is unnecessarily emphatic. It was fortunate that the present author had the opportunity to discuss the reading with Professor Takao Moriyasu at the Akademienvorhaben Turfanforschung in Berlin while both attending the "Turfan Revisited" conference in September, 2002. Professor Moriyasu insisted that the *-ilärning* ending must be preceded by an actual place-name as it was almost certainly a translation of the Chinese "of the various districts" (*zhulu*). So, I narrowed the search for a place-name to fit the hard-to-read letters in Syriac script at the beginning of the first word which, as Professor Aloïs van Tongerloo of the Catholic University of Leuven had already noted to me more than once, reads very like *m'ny-* (i.e. Mani). Although the Chinese version mentions Mar Solomon's role as bishop in charge of Nestorians and Manichaeans, a senior Nestorian cleric was never likely to have had as the first and most prominent part of his titulature "of the Manichaean districts of…" The ongoing debate on the authenticity of the *City of Light* might have made an unexpected contribution to the solution of our puzzle. In David Selbourne's book, the region south of the Yangtze is almost always referred to as Manzi. This has always struck me as an anachronism, as its use in a work which was said to have chronicled a visit to Quanzhou five years before the Mongol occupation of the city in 1277, is tantamount to associating the government of France with 'Vichy' before July 1940, as Manzi was used principally by foreign visitors to China like Marco Polo to designate South China *after* the Mongol Conquest. Close examination of the initial letters of this unusually long

[38] Niu Ruji, "Cong chutu beiming kan Quanzhou he Yangzhou de Jingjiao laiyuan (On the origin of Nestorianism in Quanzhou and Yangzhou from the inscriptions of the excavated tombstones)," *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* (*Researches in World Religions*) 93/2 (2003): 75.

first word as given in the publication of Wu Wenliang suggests *m'nzy-* or *mynzy-* as a possible reading for the place-name. Many hours were spent by the Australian team trying to read the word on the stone as exhibited in the Quanzhou Maritime Museum.[39] It was not until the last day but one of the Australian team's 2005 visit that a senior technician revealed the fact that the stone we have lavished so many hours on is a high quality replica of the original which for security reasons is now kept in the Fujian Provincial Museum in Fuzhou – a city some two hundred kilometers away from Quanzhou. The team hopes to make the journey to Fuzhou in the near future. We believe nevertheless that our reading of *m(a)nzi-* should be taken seriously by scholars because it fits precisely with the information provided by the Chinese version of the text, viz. Mar Solomon was Bishop of the various administrative districts of Manzi (in Chinese *Minzhe*), i.e., the region south of the Yangtze River (*jiangnan zhulu*).

Although a large number of Nestorian funerary inscriptions in Syriac, mostly from the period of Mongol domination, have been found in Central Asia and published by scholars like Chwolson[40] and Klein,[41] the number in Syro-Turkic is still very small.[42] While inscriptions in Syriac and in Syro-Turkic both continued to use the 'Greek' (i.e. Seleucid) system of year-reckoning, at least three of the inscriptions in Syro-Turkic found in Quanzhou exhibit a much more elaborate dating formula than those found in Central Asia. The formula on the best preserved and most recently discovered (May, 2002) of the three stones gives:[43]

---

[39] The epigraphical team in 2005 consisted of Professor Majella Franzmann and the present author, with Professor Nicholas Sims-Williams, FBA, as an international research collaborator whose visit to Quanzhou was part-funded by the British Academy under the aegis of the Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum project.

[40] D. Chwolson, *Syrische Grabinschriften aus Semirjetschie*, Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, VII[e] sér., Tome XXXIV, 4 (St.-Pétersbourg, 1886), and *idem*, *Syrisch-Nestorianische Grabinschriften aus Semirjetschie, Nebst einer Beilage: 'Über das türkische Sprachmaterial dieser Grabinschriften von W. Radloff, mit drei phototypischen Tafeln und einer ebensolchen, von Julius Euting ausgearbeiteten Schriftafel'*, Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, VII[e] sér., Tome XXXVII No. 8 (St.-Pétersbourg, 1890).

[41] W. Klein, *Das nestorianische Christentum an den Handelswegen durch Kyrgyzstan bis zum 14.Jh*, Silk Road Studies III (Turnhout, 2000), 158–76.

[42] See especially those collected in C. Džumagulov, *Yazyk syro-tjurkskix (nestorianskix) Pamjatnikov Kirgizii* (Frunze, 1971). See also the important bilingual (Syro-Turkic and Chinese) inscription from Yangzhou which belongs to the same period as similar inscriptions found in Quanzhou. Cf. Geng Shimin, H.-J. Klimkeit, and J.-P. Laut, "Eine neue nestorianische Grabinschrift aus China," *Ural-altaistische Jahrbücher* 14 (1996): 164–75.

[43] The inscription which is now in the Quanzhou Municipal Museum at the time of writing still does not carry an accession-number. It was found in Chidian in the

> In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, forever. In the year one thousand six hundred and twenty-four of the reckoning of Alexander the Great King, the son of King Philip from the state of Macedonia (= 1313 CE), in the Year of the Ox of the Turkish reckoning, in the third month, on the sixth day,…

The typical dating formula of Syriac inscriptions on Nestorian tombstones is much simpler and shows little recollection of the Macedonian roots of the Seleucid system:[44]

> This is the grave of Ama the Chorepiscopus (i.e. regional bishop). In the year one thousand five hundred and sixty-six (= 1255 CE), he departed from this world in the month of Ab (= July), on Sunday.… May our Lord mingle his soul with that of the Pious and the Just.

While 'Khan Alexander' is frequently encountered in dating formulae in Syro-Turkic inscriptions from Central Asia, the mention of his father Philip and of his homeland Macedonia is extremely rare. In fact of the twenty or so Syro-Turkic inscriptions published by Džumagulov, only one mentions Macedonia,[45] none mentions Philip, and none gives Alexander the epithet of *ilig-khan* which literally means 'king with a realm' (hence the royal Il-Khans who underpinned the Eurasian Mongol Empire) which must be the Turkish equivalent of the Persian title *Shahanshah* (king of kings). Even the very formal formula found in the Syriac version of the famous bilingual (Chinese and Syriac) Sianfu inscription found in Xi'an in 1653 CE which gives an official account of the reception of Nestorianism by Tang Government in China from 638 to 781 CE does not allude to Alexander or Philip in its Seleucid dating formula:[46]

> Adam, priest and chorepicopus and *fapshi* of Zin(i)stan. In the days of the Father of Fathers Mar Hananishu Catholicus Patriarch. In the year one thousand and ninety and two of the Greeks (= 781 CE) my lord Izd-buzid priest and Chorepiscopus of Khumdan the metropolis (i.e.,

---

vicinity of Quanzhou in 2002. The stone carries the provisional number of Z47 in the working catalogue of the Australian team. Cf. Niu Ruji, "A New Syriac-Uighur Inscription from China (Quanzhou, Fujian China)," *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 4 (2004): 60–65, and Franzmann, Eccles, and Lieu, "Observations on Select Christian Inscriptions," 265–66.

[44] Chwolson, *Syrische Grabinschriften aus Semirjetschie* (see above note 37), no. 66 (138), 14.

[45] Cf. Džumagulov, *Yazyk syro-tjurkskix*, 91.

[46] Syriac text from P. Y. Saeki, *The Nestorian Documents and Relics in China* (Tokyo, 1937), Chinese Text Section, 11.

> Changan), son of the late Milis priest, from Balkh a city of Tahuristan (i.e., Tocharistan), set up that tablet of stone…[47]

The only example of an inscription in Syriac naming Alexander as the son of Philip of Macedonia in the dating formula I have been able to find comes from the Kefr Lab region in Southern Syria. In translation this reads:[48]

> In the year one thousand and eighty and [four] (= 772/3 CE) according to the era of Alexandros the son of Philippos the Macedonian. – I, Daniel am I.

All three of the more elaborate dating formulae found on Nestorian tombstones from Quanzhou could have come from a single template, but how the scribe could have devised such a "historical" and typically Greek formula when the Nestorian Christianity had flourished mainly in Iran and Central Asia under Sassanian and Arab rule certainly remains a mystery.

Another major addition to the Nestorian material catalogued by Wu Wenliang is a large funerary inscription entirely in Turkish and in the Uighur script. Unlike the epigraphical material in Syro-Turkic, the content of this inscription is relatively straight forward, for the trained Altaicist and Professors James Hamilton and Niu Ruji had published the *editio major* text with French translation more than a decade ago.[49] The stone was discovered in 1941 near the East Gate of Quanzhou but was deposited in the Museum of the Department of Anthropology of Xiamen University until 1951. Since then it appears to have vanished from this particular Museum despite its relatively large size (33 × 69.5 cms).[50] A replica version of it is now on display in the Quanzhou Maritime Museum. The edition of Hamilton and Niu can be translated as follows:

> In the Year of the Sheep, the second day of the *man* (i.e. full moon) period of the month of fasting (i.e., the twelfth month) (= 31st December, 1331? CE),

---

[47] English trans. Moule, *Christians in China*, 48.

[48] E. Littmann, ed., *Publication of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904–1905 and 1909, Division IV, Section B, Syriac Inscriptions* (Leiden, 1934), inscr. 51, 41.

[49] J. Hamilton and Niu Ruji, "Deux inscriptions funéraires turques nestoriennes," *Journal Asiatique*, 282 (1994): 156.

[50] The stone carries the number of Z6r in the Australian Team's Working-Catalogue (r indicating that the only version available to the team is a replicated version now on display in the Quanzhou Maritime Museum).

> the Lady (i.e. wife) of the Christian (*ärkägün*) Qupluγ Xuβilgan, Martha Terim fulfilled the commandment of God (and) ascended to the divine heaven.

Besides being one of a handful of Turkic Nestorian inscriptions in the Uighur script found in China,[51] the text is of great importance in that it gives uniquely in foreign script the most commonly used word for Christian in China under Mongol rule, viz. *yelikewen*. This word was phonetically transliterated from a foreign word into Chinese as the four characters have no meaning as a phrase. It has frequently been suggested that the term comes from the Arabic word Rekhabuin,[52] but there is very little Arabic influence in extant Nestorian texts and inscriptions found in Central Asia and China. The way in which the word is given in Turkish, ärkägün, strongly suggests to the late James Hamilton the Greek word ἀρχηγόν, the accusative form of ἀρχηγός.[53] Thus we may have another example of a word of Hellenistic origin in use in medieval China, and one which is also well known to us as the title of the Grand Imam of the Manichaean Church in Seleucia-Ctesiphon after the death of Mani.[54]

[51] For another rare example see Hamilton and Niu, "Deux inscriptions," 150. This interestingly contains two lines in Syriac and written in the Syriac script.

[52] Cf. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire* (see note 2), 297.

[53] Hamilton and Niu, "Deux inscriptions," 160.

[54] On the use of the term to designate a Manichaean priest of the highest rank see *Kephalaia* 6.22 *et passim*, *Kephalaia*, H. J. Polotsky and A. Böhlig, eds. (Stuttgart, 1940–).

SUKHĀVATĪ AND THE LIGHT-WORLD: PURE LAND ELEMENTS IN THE CHINESE MANICHAEAN *EULOGY OF THE LIGHT-WORLD*

Gunner Mikkelsen
Sydney

Pure Land devotionalism was the most popular and widespread form of Mahāyāna Buddhism in medieval China. The image of Amitābha and his Pure Land or Western Paradise, known in Sanskrit as Sukhāvatī, "Land of Bliss", with all its splendour and magnificence, captured the imagination of countless Chinese who aspired to be reborn there and thus attain complete enlightenment and buddhahood. The popularity of Amitābha in the Tang period is seen in mural paintings of the Mogao caves at Dunhuang,[1] and it is attested in the change of thematic emphases in the sculptural art of the Longmen caves near Luoyang. An investigation by Tsukamoto Zenryū of dated inscriptions of statues in the Longmen caves has shown that the number of carved images of Amitābha and his attendant bodhisattva Guanyin 觀音 (Avalokiteśvara) here increased from 30 between 500 and 540 CE to 147 between 650 and 690, whereas the number of images of Śākyamuni and Maitreya in the same period decreased from 78 to 19.[2] This significant rise in the number of Amitābha images in Buddhist art coincided with and may be seen partly as an outcome of the proselytizing activities of Shandao 善道, the third of the great Pure Land masters, who effectively and successfully spread the teachings of the Pure Land school in the capital Chang'an from the 640's to his death in 681. Shandao's achievements are well documented. He wrote several works, produced and distributed thousands of copies of the *Amita Sūtra*, and painted more than three hundred pictures of Sukhāvatī.[3] According to the 11th-century *Xinxiu wangsheng zhuan* 新修往生傳, "the monks and laymen who submitted to

[1] Cf. Shi 2002.
[2] Tsukamoto 1942, 371–80. See also Seah 1975, 173–82, Pas 1987, 78, and Pas 1995, 68.
[3] For Shandao's artistic work, see the comments in Pas 1987, 77–78 and Chappell 1996, 160–61.

him in their minds were as numerous as those going to market." Some of these followers were affected by his teachings to such a degree that they committed suicide by "throwing themselves from a high mountain range," "jumping into a deep well," or "setting themselves on fire," in order to hasten their entry into the Pure Land.[4] The growth of the Pure Land movement in the seventh and eighth centuries was considerable, and in the second half of the eighth, following the An Lushan rebellion, its practices were introduced at the court.

More than one fifth of all Mahāyāna sūtras of Indian origin in the Chinese Buddhist Canon mention Amitābha and his Pure Land.[5] Particularly important to the Pure Land school were the Larger and Smaller *Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra*s (*Sūtra*s *on the Land of Bliss*), which are believed to have been composed in Northwest India in Gāndhārī or a related Northwestern Prākrit language around 100 CE. Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of both texts are extant, and fragments in Old Turkish and Khotanese from the Turfan region and Dunhuang testify to the popularity of Amitābha and Sukhāvatī at Buddhist centres in Central Asia.[6] From the third (or possibly second) century to the tenth, several Chinese translations of the *Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra*s were produced. Twelve translations of the *Larger Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra* are recorded in Chinese Buddhist catalogues; of these five are extant. The most influential translation, entitled *Foshuo Wuliangshou jing* 佛說無量壽經 (*Sūtra on the Buddha of Infinite Life preached by the Buddha*), is attributed to Kang Sengkai 康僧鎧 (Samghavarman, ca. 252 CE) but may – as surmised by Fujita Kōtatsu – have been produced by Buddhabhadra and Baoyun 寶雲 around 421.[7] The most influential translation of the *Smaller Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra*, entitled *Foshuo Amituo jing* 佛說阿彌陀經 (*Amita Sūtra preached by the Buddha*), was made by Kumārajīva in 402 or shortly after; the *Smaller*

[4] Pas 1987, 69–70; Pas 1995, 91.

[5] Yabuki 1937, 450–74; Fujita 1973, 141–61.

[6] For recent English translations of the Sanskrit texts, see Gómez 1996, 61–122. For editions and translations of Central Asian versions, see Zieme 1985, 129–49 (seven fragments of *L.Sukh.* and one of *S.Sukh.* in Old Turkish from Sängim); Hamilton 1986, I, 26–29 and II, 271–72 (fragment of *L.Sukh.* in Old Turkish from Dunhuang); Kudara/Zieme 1997, 73–82 (two fragments of *L.Sukh.* in Old Turkish from Yarkhoto); Kudara/Zieme 1985 (fragments of the *Contemplation Sūtra* in Old Turkish from the Turfan region); Elverskog 1997, 50–51, 63–65; Gómez 2004, 62–68 (*S.Sukh.* in Tibetan); Skjærvø 2002, 176 (fragment of *L.Sukh.* in Khotanese from Khadaliq).

[7] Fujita 1996, 7. The text is edited in *T.* XII (360), 265c–79a, and translated in Inagaki 1995, 227–313 and Gómez 1996, 153–222.

Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra was translated also by Xuanzang 玄奘 in 650.[8] A third text, the *Foshuo Guan Wuliangshou fo jing* 佛說觀無量壽佛經 (*Sūtra on Contemplation of the Buddha of Infinite Life preached by the Buddha*), commonly known as the *Contemplation* (or *Meditation*) *Sūtra*, belongs to the central corpus of Chinese Pure Land texts. Buddhist catalogues attribute the translation of the extant Chinese version of the *Contemplation Sūtra* to Kālayaśas, some time between 424 and 442, but the sūtra is likely to have been either a Central Asian or Chinese compilation as Sanskrit versions are absent.[9]

Each of the three Pure Land sūtras contains vivid and detailed descriptions of Sukhāvatī. In the principal Chinese translations of the two *Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtras* from the fifth century, it is characterised by the following main features:[10] (1) the land is located in a western direction of the universe; (2) it is vast and has no boundaries; (3) it has no Mount Sumeru, rings of mountains, or land features of our world system; (4) it has no greater or smaller seas, no torrents, canals, wells, or valleys; (5) it has no hells, realms of hungry ghosts (*egui* 餓鬼) or animals; (6) it has no light from sun, moon and stars, yet no darkness; (7) it has no seasons; (8) its climate is always mild; (9) its land is flat and even; (10) its land is made of seven precious substances (Chin. *qibao* 七寶; Skt. *saptaratna*; i.e. gold, silver, beryl, coral, amber, mother-of-pearl, and agate); (11) it is covered by countless gems; (12) around the land are seven tiers of railings, seven rows of netting, and seven rows of trees, all made from the seven precious substances and all emitting bright light; (13) pearl nets and jewelled curtains cover the seven-jewelled trees; (14) the trees all stand in neat rows next to each other and are colourful and bright; (15) pure and gentle breezes blow among the trees and nets and produce enchanting music and marvellous sounds of the Law which spread to all the buddha-lands in the ten directions of the universe; (16) the breezes move jewelled bells hanging around the

[8] Kumārajīva's translation: *T.* XII (366), 346b–48b; trans. Inagaki 1995, 353–60 and Gómez 1996, 145–51. Xuanzang's translation: *T.* XII (367), 348b–51b.

[9] Fujita 1990, 154ff. Ed. *T.* XII (365), 340b–46b, trans. Yamada 1984 and Inagaki 1995, 317–50. No manuscripts containing the *Contemplation Sūtra* in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Khotanese have been found.

[10] Main passages on Sukhāvatī in *L.Sukh: T.* XII (360), 270a, 270c–72b; Inagaki 1995, 253–54, 258–67; Gómez 1996, 176, 179–86; main passages in *S.Sukh: T.* XII (366), 346c–47b; Inagaki 1995, 353–55; Gómez 1996, 146–47. The descriptions of Sukhāvatī in the Chinese sūtras are more elaborate than in the Sanskrit versions. See also Fujita 1996, 22 on variations in the earlier and later descriptions.

nets, and these and the trees emit the sounds of the Law and spread sweet perfumes; (17) the trees bear flowers from which appear various light-emitting fruits of the seven precious substances; (18) Mandāra flowers (i.e. red flowers from the Indian coral tree, one of the four heavenly trees) rain down from heaven and cover the ground; (19) jewel lotuses fill the land; (20) ponds made of the seven precious substances are filled with water which is pure, clean, fragrant and sweet-tasting like ambrosia (Chin. *ganlu* 甘露 'sweet dew'); (21) pavilions made of the seven precious substances are situated above the pools; (22) heavenly music is played by countless gods in countless jewelled pavilions; (23) ten thousand varieties of music consisting of sounds of the Law are constantly heard; (24) Amitābha and disciples, bodhisattvas, among them Guanyin and Shizhi 勢止 (Mahāsthāmaprāpta), as well as humans and gods who all possess wisdom and supernatural powers, inhabit the land; (25) all physical forms of the inhabitants are equal; (26) the inhabitants are of noble and majestic countenance, and their appearance is more impressive than seen anywhere; (27) they are able to see the land clearly as if they were looking at their own reflection in a bright mirror; (28) light emitted from Amitābha shines in all the buddha-lands in the ten directions of the universe; (29) lecture halls, monks' quarters, palaces, mansions, pavilions and watchtowers are all adorned with the seven jewels; (30) there is an abundance of food and drink, garments, flowers, perfume, ornaments, silken parasols and banners; (31) flocks of various sweet-voiced birds inhabit the land; (32) like the realm of Nirvāna, the land is pure and serene, and it is resplendent and blissful; (33) there are no sorrows or afflictions, and (34) all human needs are satisfied by heavenly blessings.

It is hardly surprising that this opulent depiction of Amitābha's Sukhāvatī provided strong inspiration for the depiction of paradise, the world of Light, in Chinese Manichaean hymns. In the hymns and prayers in the so-called *Hymn-scroll* (*Xiabu zan* 下部讚) from Dunhuang, the translator Daoming 道明 draws extensively from Pure Land texts and their technical terminology.[11] The Light-world is called "World of utmost happiness" (*jile shijie* 極樂世界), which is the standard rendering of "Sukhāvatī" in the *Contemplation Sūtra* and in Xuanzang's translation of the *Smaller Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra*. It is called "Country of peace and

[11] British Library, S 2659 (= *H.*). For Pure Land and other Buddhist terms and concepts in this, see Schmidt-Glintzer 1987b and Mikkelsen 2002.

happiness" (*anle guo* 安樂國), a name occurring in the chief translation of the *Larger Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra*,[12] and also "Nirvāna-world" (*niepan jie* 涅槃界), "Nirvāna-land" (*niepan guotu* 涅槃國土), "Nirvāna-world of eternal light" and "Eternal light-world of *nirvāna*" (*niepan changming shijie* 涅槃常明世界),[13] and simply "new pure land" (*xin jingtu* 新淨土).[14] Neutral terms for "World of Light" are employed for instance in the title and text of the *Tan mingjie wen* 歎明界文 (*Eulogy of the Light-world* (= *ELW*)).[15] In this lengthy hymn, the Light-world is praised as a "World of utmost happiness" and "Nirvāna-world" that is identical or very similar to Sukhāvatī in a remarkably large number of points:[16] (1) it is boundless; (2) its countries are numerous as grains of dust or sand, and are all alike; (3) the world and its countries are marvellously adorned with jewels and have jewel earth or soil of diamond that glitters in countless colours; (4) the soil of the countries is abundant and fertile; (5) innumerable lands in layers or gradations are all fully visible in every detail; (6) life-giving waters, deep and clear from numerous streams, rivers, seas and fountain-heads, are fragrant and wonderful, and one does not drift away nor is drowned in them; (7) clean streams flow ceaselessly from fountain-heads tasting like ambrosia (sweet dew); (8) jewelled trees stand in rows; (9) their roots, trunks, branches and leaves are all like ambrosia; (10) their jewel fruits always thrive, never rot, are fragrant and delicious, taste like ambrosia, and are all of the same size; (11) their jewel flowers are always red and white; (12) wonderful fragrances spread from spacious, splendid, pure gardens and orchards and pervade the world; (13) mild and pleasant winds blow in the ten directions of the universe; (14) the winds touch jewelled towers and pavilions and stir jewel bells into tinkling; (15) streets, roads, lanes and foot-paths are splendidly adorned; (16) the land is pure, without dust

---

[12] *H.* 60d, 247d, 328b, 332c. *Jile shijie* 極樂世界 in the *Contemplation Sūtra: T.* XII (365) 341b29, c8, c20, c27, 342a23, b24, c10, *passim*; in Xuanzang's translation of the *S.Sukh.: T.* XII (367) 348c16, 17, 22, 23, *passim*. *Anle guo* 安樂國 in the *L.Sukh.: T.* XII (360), 275b6, 278a1. Both names are used in several other Pure Land texts.

[13] *H.* 327b, 389, 399.

[14] *H.* 41b; cf. the mention of 'being born in the pure land' in the Manichaean *Treatise on the Light-Nous* in Chinese from Dunhuang (Beijing National Library, BD 8470), col. 199.

[15] For all occurrences of the term "world of Light" (*guangming jie* 光明界, *guangming shijie* 光明世界, *mingjie* 明界) in the Chinese Manichaean texts, see Mikkelsen 2006, 24 and 44.

[16] *H.* 261–338 (*ELW* 1–78); ed. Lin 1997: 305–10 and *T.* LIV (2140), 1276a–78a; trans. Tsui 1943, 199–208 and Schmidt-Glintzer 1987a, 44–52.

or dirt; (17) light pervades everywhere, no place is dark; it is without shadow, gloom and dusk; (18) the land is constantly blissful, peaceful, safe, calm, and eternally free from terrors; (19) it is free from birth and death, destruction and impermanency – life is eternal; (20) saintly masses (*shengzhong* 聖眾), buddhas (*zhufo* 諸佛) and light-envoys (*mingshi* 明使) inhabit the land; (21) no devils (*mo* 魔); hungry ghosts (*egui* 餓鬼) and animals exist there; (22) lecture halls, temples, palaces and mansions are all adorned with (or made of) marvellous jewels; (23) all inhabitants live safely and happily in rich, pure and imposing monasteries (*qielan* 伽藍);[17] (24) the temples and monasteries are all alike and all emit light; (25) all natures and forms are equal; (26) there are no sorrows or afflictions, no ignorance, passion or desire; (27) there is an abundance of food and drink tasting like ambrosia; (28) the saintly masses wear unique clothes, ornaments, etc. of many marvellous colors; (29) the saintly masses are enlightened and possess wisdom; (30) their appearances are marvellous and unique, and (31) the saintly masses are able to see all things and phenomena in the Light-world as if facing a bright mirror. Further features are described in one other text of the *Hymn-scroll*, a confessional prayer for the hearers: (32) the land has fragrant ponds made from seven precious substances and filled with life-giving water;[18] (33) it has flags, floral patterns and jewelled parasols;[19] (34) its roads are flat and even;[20] (35) Guanyin and Shizhi are among the holy ones;[21] (36) the holy ones sing endless praises.[22]

The colophon of the *ELW* ascribes its original composition to Mo Mao 末冒, a "teacher" (*mushe* 慕闍; cf. Parthian *'mwc'g/'mwcg*, Sogdian *mwz"k*) who may be identified as Mār Ammō, Mani's "apostle to the East".[23] In the mid-third century, Mār Ammō brought the mission of the Manichaean church to the regions around the Oxus and into Kushāna, where it is likely that he encountered the Mahāyāna notion of Buddha-lands, including the most splendid one presided over by

---

[17] This is an abbreviated form of 僧伽藍摩 *sengqielanmo* which transcribes Skt. *sanghārāma* 'monastery, convent'. In *H.* 267a–b (*ELW* 6) is referred to the *fatang* 法堂 'halls of law' of the saintly masses and the *qielansuo* 伽藍所 of the buddhas.

[18] *H.* 391.

[19] *H.* 396.

[20] *H.* 397, with reference to *Lushena jingjie* 盧舍那境界 "realm of Lushena", i.e. the Column of Glory.

[21] *H.* 391.

[22] *H.* 395–96.

[23] *H.* 261. Cf. Henning *apud* Tsui 1943, 216 note 6; Sundermann 1991, 110–11; and Bryder 1999, 259–62.

Amitābha. However, the hymn that has been identified as the text on which Daoming based his translation, namely the first canto of the *Huyadagmān* hymn-cycle in Parthian, contains no trace of distinctly Buddhist notions and terminology.[24] In the surviving fragments of this canto, all recovered at Turfan, the description of the Light-world is far less detailed than that of the *ELW*. The Light-world is described as (1) a boundless land, that has (2) fragrant lakes, (3) trees which carry fruits that never rot, (4) happiness, (5) light and no darkness, (6) no searing wind, (7) no destruction or pain, (8) no hunger or thirst, and it has (9) inhabitants who sing wonderful praises.[25] Fragments of versions of the hymn in Sogdian and Old Turkish found in the Turfan region do not add significantly to this description.[26] Some of the features included in the *ELW*'s portrayal of the Light-world are attested in other Manichaean texts from the Turfan region. In one abecedarian hymn in Parthian, for instance, the "Land of Light" (*zmyg rwšn*) is praised as being "fragrant with sweet-smelling breezes", and it is described as having powers, gods, deities, jewels, joyous aeons, trees, springs, and plants.[27] Another Parthian hymn of the same type mentions splendid trees, divine springs, sweet winds, and splendid thrones.[28] A prose text in Sogdian gives a description of the Light Earth or Land of Light, the fifth of the "five greatnesses" of the Light-world.[29] This is in several points similar to the description given in the *Huyadagmān*:

> The fifth, the Light Earth, *self-existent, eternal, miraculous; in *height it is beyond *reach(?), its *depth cannot be perceived. No enemy and no *injurer walk this earth: its divine pavement is of the substance of diamond (*vajra*) that does not shake forever. All good things are born from it: adorned, graceful hills wholly covered with flowers, grown in much excellence; green fruit-bearing trees whose fruits never *drop, never rot, and never become *wormed; springs flowing with ambrosia that fill the

[24] The number of Indian words in early Manichaean texts in Parthian is small, cf. Sims-Williams 1983, 133.

[25] Boyce 1954, 68–77; Sims-Williams 1989, 322ff; Sundermann 1990, 14, 22; Klimkeit 1993, 100–2; Bryder 1999, 262–70.

[26] For these, see Sundermann 1990, 23–24; Reck 2005, 159–63; Henning 1959, 122–24; Le Coq 1922, 45 (no. 32); Zieme 1975, 46–47; Klimkeit 1993, 102, 107; Bryder 1999, 263, 266–71. The Sogdian versions appear to be closer to the Parthian than to the *ELW*.

[27] Boyce 1952, 442–44 (text C).

[28] Boyce 1952, 437–40 (text A).

[29] See infra, note 33.

> whole universe, its groves and plains; countless mansions and palaces, thrones and *benches that exist in perpetuity for ever and ever.
>
> Thus arranged is the Paradise, in these Five Greatnesses. They are calm in quietude and know no fear. They live in the light, where they have no darkness; in eternal life, where they have no death; in health without sickness; in joy, where they have no sorrow; in charity without hatred; in the company of friends, where they have no separation; in a shape that is not brought to naught, in a divine body where there is no destruction; on ambrosial food without restriction, wherefore they bear no toil and hardship. In appearance they are ornate, in strength powerful, in wealth exceedingly rich; of poverty they know not even the name. Nay, they are equipped, beautiful, and embellished; no damage occurs to their bodies. Their garment of joy is finery that never get soiled, of seventy myriad kinds, set with jewels. Their places are never destroyed…[30]

Although this text contains one or two Indian elements, the main inspirations for all of these descriptions are clearly West Asian rather than Indian and Buddhist. The image of the Light-world generally painted in the Middle Iranian texts is reminiscent of the image of the "Land of Light" in the Manichaean *Psalm-Book* in Coptic. In various psalms of the *Psalm-Book*, the Light-world is praised as a glorious, peaceful and joyous place where gods, angels, and blessed ones dwell, and where there is "neither heat nor cold," "neither hunger nor thirst," and no sorrow. The Land has fragrant blooming trees, fountains filled with life, green fields, and dew of ambrosia.[31]

It is obvious that the large-scale import of the features of Sukhāvatī from the Chinese Pure Land sūtras has created a far more detailed and impressive image of the Light-world in the *ELW* than in the first canto of the Parthian *Huyadagmān*. The expansion is partly a result of the translator's choice of a more elaborate metre; verses of two lines in the Parthian hymn are translated into verses of four lines in the Chinese eulogy. As stated in the colophon, the *ELW* is organised in "seventy-eight verses, each in four clauses" (*fan qishiba song fen si ju* 凡七十八頌分四句).[32] In accordance with the predominant form of versification during the Tang, the *qiyan jueju* 七言絕句, each verse is a quatrain with seven characters to each clause or line. *Qiyan jueju* was

[30] M 178; Henning 1948, 307–10.
[31] Allberry 1938, 65, 136, 143, 144, 154.
[32] *H.* 261. The actual number of verses is seventy-seven; possibly the colophon was counted as one verse.

adopted widely in poetry and in Buddhist literature, including several Pure Land texts.

Daoming's decision to depict the Light-world as a pure land that closely matches the most splendid and most popular of all Buddhist pure lands was, however, not ruled by considerations of the poetic metre and rhyme schemes. His ambition was to present the Manichaean notion of paradise as attractively as possible to Chinese audiences. The adaptation to Buddhism is in the *ELW* taken a great distance further than simple outward "dressing" of this notion in Buddhist language – a technique applied to most of the Manichaean texts in Chinese. The Light-world is presented as a "new pure land" that is nearly identical to and certainly as splendid as Sukhāvatī and even carries its name. There is, however, hardly any doubt that the original Manichaean identity of this pure land was retained. Distinctively Manichaean concepts such as the "five greatnesses" and the "three constancies" are mentioned.[33] Amitābha is absent, and the Light-world is not described as specifically located in the West or in any other direction of the universe. Such differences in key features would have helped to ensure that the Manichaean audiences and followers in China were able to distinguish between the two paradises.

[33] The "five greatnesses" (*wuda* 五大, *wu zhong da* 五種大) and "three constancies" (*sanchang* 三常), which "steadily illuminate each other," are mentioned in *ELW* 75 (*H.* 336c). The five greatnesses, i.e. the five parts of the Light-world, are enumerated in the *Universal praise and petition* (*H.* 122–23) and *Eulogy of the Light Venerable Ones* (*H.* 357). In the latter, they are listed as: (1) "the great true lord" (*da zhenshi zhu* 大真實主), (2) "the twelve light-kings" (*shi'er guangwang* 十二光王), (3) "numerous wonderful worlds and lands as numerous as fine dust" (*zhongmiao shijie weichen guotu* 眾妙世界微塵國土), (4) "the eternally living wonderful air" (*changhuo miaokong* 常活妙空), and (5) "the praiseworthy land/earth" (*kan baoyu di* 堪褒譽地). This corresponds to fragmentarily preserved lists of the greatnesses in Parthian and Sogdian texts; cf. Waldschmidt/Lentz 1933, 549; Boyce 1975, 92; Klimkeit 1993, 30; Henning 1948, 307–8; Gharib 2000, 259ff. And it corresponds to the list in the *Psalm of the Bema* CCXXIII of the Coptic *Psalm-Book* (9.12–16, ed. and trans. Allberry 1938): "The Kingdom of Light, on the one hand (μέν) consisted in five Greatnesses, and they are the Father and his twelve Aeons and the Aeons of the Aeons, the Living Air (ἀήρ), the Land of Light; the great Spirit breathing in them, nourishing them with his Light." For the three constancies, see Waldschmidt/Lentz 1926, 98–99 n. 11, and Lin 1997, 242ff.

Bibliography

Allberry, C. R. C.
1938 *A Manichaean Psalm-Book, Part II*, Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Library Collection 2 (Stuttgart).

Boyce, Mary
1952 Some Parthian abecedarian hymns, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 14: 435–50.
1954 *The Manichaean hymn-cycles in Parthian*, London Oriental Series 3, (London).
1975 *A reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian. Texts with notes*, Acta Iranica, sér. 3, II, 9; Textes et mémoires (Téhéran – Liège – Leiden).

Bryder, Peter
1985 *The Chinese transformation of Manichaeism. A study of Chinese Manichaean terminology* (Löberöd).
1999 Huyadagmān, *Geng Shimin xiansheng 70 shouchen jinian wenji* 耿世民先生 70 寿辰纪念文集 *(Collected works in commemoration of the 70th birthday of Mr. Geng Shimin)*, Ji Zengxiang 季增祥, ed. (Beijing), 252–75.

Chappell, David W.
1996 The formation of the Pure Land movement in China: Tao-ch'o and Shan-tao, *The Pure Land tradition: history and development*, Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 3, James H. Foard, Michael Solomon, and Richard K. Payne, eds. (Berkeley), 139–71.

Elverskog, Johan
1997 *Uygur Buddhist literature*, Silk Road Studies 1 (Turnhout).

Fujita Kōtatsu
1973 藤田宏達: *Genshi Jōdo shisō no kenkyū* 原始淨土思想の研究 *(A Study of Early Pure Land Buddhism)* (Tokyo).
1990 The textual origins of the *Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching*: a canonical scripture of Pure Land Buddhism, *Chinese Buddhist apocrypha*, Robert E. Buswell, ed. (Honolulu), 149–73.
1996 Pure Land Buddhism in India, *The Pure Land tradition: history and development*, Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 3, James H. Foard, Michael Solomon, Richard K. Payne, eds. (Berkeley), 1–42.

Gharib, Badri
2000 New light on two words in the Sogdian version of the 'Light Paradise or the Realm of Light', *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongress zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997*, Berichte und Abhandlungen; Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Sonderband 4, in Ronald E. Emmerick, Werner Sundermann, Peter Zieme, eds. (Berlin), 258–69.

Gómez, Luis O.
1996 *The Land of Bliss. The paradise of the Buddha of Measureless Light. Sanskrit and Chinese versions of the Sukhāvatīvyūha Sutras*, Studies in the Buddhist traditions (Honolulu – Kyoto).
2004 The Wonderful Panoply of the Land of Bliss, *Buddhist scriptures*, Donald S. Lopez, ed. (London), 62–68.

Hamilton, James R.
1986 *Manuscrits ouïgours du IX^e–X^e siècle de Touen-houang. Textes établis, traduits et commentés*, I–II (Paris).

Henning, Walter B.
1948 A Sogdian fragment of the Manichaean cosmogony, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 12: 306–18 (repr. in *W. B. Henning, Selected papers*, II, Acta Iranica, 15; Hommages et Opera Minora, VI [Téhéran – Liège – Leiden, 1977], 301–13).

1959 A fragment of the Manichaean hymn-cycles in Old Turkish, *Asia Major* 1959, 122–24 (repr. in *W. B. Henning, Selected papers*, II, Acta Iranica, 15; Hommages et Opera Minora, VI [Téhéran-Liège – Leiden, 1977], 537–39).

Inagaki Hisao, in collaboration with Harold Stewart
1995 *The Three Pure Land sutras. A study and translation from Chinese*, 2nd revised edition (Kyoto).

Klimkeit, Hans-Joachim
1993 *Gnosis on the Silk Road* (San Francisco).

Kudara Kōgi and Peter Zieme
1985 *Uigurugo no Kanmuryōjukyō* ウイグル語の觀無量壽經 *(The Guan Wuliangshou jing in Uighur)* (Kyoto).
1997 Two new fragments of the *Larger Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra* in Uigur, *Nairiku Ajia gengō no kenkyū* 内陸アジア言語の研究/*Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 12: 73–82.

Le Coq, Albert von
1922 *Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho. III. Nebst einem christlichen Bruchstück aus Bulayïq*, Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft, Phil.-hist. Kl., no. 2 (Berlin).

Lin Wushu 林悟殊
1997 *Monijiao ji qi dongjian* 摩尼教及其東漸 *(Manichaeism and its eastward expansion)*, Shijie wenhua congshu 33 (Taibei).

Mikkelsen, Gunner B.
2002 'Quickly guide me to the peace of the Pure Land': Christology and Buddhist terminology in the Chinese Manichaean *Hymnscroll*, *The Chinese face of Jesus Christ*, I, Monumenta Serica Monograph Series 50/1, Roman Malek, ed. (Skt. Augustin – Nettetal), 219–42.
2006 *Dictionary of Manichaean texts*, Vol. III. *Texts from Central Asia and China*, Part 4. *Dictionary of Manichaean texts in Chinese*, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Subsidia (Turnhout).

Pas, Julian
1987 Dimensions in the life and thought of Shan-tao (613–81), *Buddhist and Taoist practice in medieval Chinese society. Buddhist and Taoist Studies II*, Asian Studies at Hawaii 34, David W. Chappell, ed. (Honolulu), 65–84.
1995 *Visions of Sukhāvatī: Shan-tao's Commentary on the Kuan Wu-liang shou-fo ching*, SUNY Series in Buddhist Studies (Albany).

Reck, Christiane
2005 Reste einer soghdischen Version von *Huyadagmān* I in der Form eines Responsoriums zwischen Erwählten und Hörer, *Languages of Iran: past and present. Iranian studies in memoriam David Neil MacKenzie*, Iranica 8, Dieter Weber, ed. (Wiesbaden), 153–63.

Schmidt-Glintzer, Helwig
1987a *Chinesische Manichaica. Mit textkritischen Anmerkungen und einem Glossar*, Studies in Oriental Religions 14 (Wiesbaden).
1987b Das buddhistische Gewand des Manichäismus. Zur buddhistischen Terminologie in den chinesischen Manichaica, *Synkretismus in den Religionen Zentralasiens. Ergebnisse eines Kolloquiums vom 24.5. bis 26.5.1983 in St. Augustin bei Bonn*, Studies in Oriental Religions 13, Walter Heissig and Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, eds. (Wiesbaden), 76–90.

Seah, Ingram S.
1975 *Shan-tao, His life and teachings*, Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary.

Shi Pingting 施萍婷 ed.
2002 *Dunhuang shiku quanji* 敦煌石窟全集 *(Complete collection of the Dunhuang grottoes)*, vol. 5: *Amituo jing hua juan* 阿弥陀经画卷 *(Paintings illustrating Amitābha Sūtra)* (Xianggang).

Sims-Williams, Nicholas
1983 Indian elements in Parthian and Sogdian, *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien. Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981*, Veröffentlichungen des Societas Uralo-Altaica 16, Klaus Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenker, eds. (Wiesbaden), 132–41.
1989 A new fragment from the Parthian hymn-cycle Huyadagmān, *Études irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard*, Studia Iranica, Cahier 7, Charles-Henri de Fouchécour and Philippe Gignoux, eds. (Paris), 321–331.
Skjærvø, Prods O., with contributions by Ursula Sims-Williams
2002 *Khotanese manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in the British Library: a complete catalogue with texts and translations*, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum; Part II: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian periods of Eastern Iran and Central Asia; Vol. V: Saka; Texts VI (London).
Sundermann, Werner
1990 *The Manichaean hymn cycles Huyadagmān and Angad Rōšnān in Parthian and Sogdian. Photo edition. Transcription and translation of hitherto unpublished texts, with critical remarks*, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Suppl. Series 2 (London).
1991 Probleme der Edition iranisch-manichäischer Texte, *Ägypten, Vorderasien, Turfan. Probleme der Edition und Bearbeitung altorientalischer Handschriften. Tagung in Berlin, Mai 1987*, Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients 23, Horst Klengel and Werner Sundermann, eds. (Berlin), 106–12. (repr. with addenda and corrigenda in *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften von Werner Sundermann*, Serie Orientale Roma LXXXIX, 1, Christiane Reck et al., eds. [Roma, 2001], I, 451–58).
Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Kaigyoku Watanabe 渡辺海旭 eds.
1924/35 *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大蔵経 *(The great collection of scriptures newly compiled in the Taishō period)* (Tokyo). [= T.]
Tsui Chi
1943 摩尼教下部讚 Mo Ni Chiao Hsia Pu Tsan, 'The lower (second?) section of the Manichæan hymns', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11: 174–219.
Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆
1942 *Shina Bukkyōshi kenkyū* 支那佛教史研究 *(A study of the history of Buddhism in China)* (Tokyo).
Waldschmidt, Ernst and Wolfgang Lentz
1926 *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus*, Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl., No. 4 (Berlin).
1933 Manichäische Dogmatik aus chinesischen und iranischen Texten, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, No. 13, 480–607.
Yabuki Keiki 矢吹慶輝:
1937 *Amida Butsu no kenkyū* 阿弥陀仏の研究 *(A study on Amitābha Buddha)*, revised edition (Tokyo).
Yamada Meiji et al.
1984 *The Sūtra of contemplation on the Buddha of Immeasurable Life*. Translated and annotated by the Ryūkoku University Translation Center, under the direction of Meiji Yamada (Kyoto).
Zieme, Peter
1975 *Manichäisch-türkische Texte. Texte, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen*, Berliner Turfantexte 5 (Berlin).
1985 Uigurische *Sukhāvatīvyūha*-Fragmente, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 12: 129–149.

ʿYMYN ʾHYND: THE BEGINNING OF MANI'S PSALM *WUZURGĀN ĀFRĪWAN* IN PARTHIAN AND MIDDLE PERSIAN

Enrico Morano

The seventh book of the canonical works ascribed to Mani,[1] believed to have been composed in his mother tongue, an Aramaic dialect, appears to be, in the Coptic lists, a collection of prayers and two psalms.[2] In the most extensive of these lists (*Homilies*, 25.2–6)[3] the seven canonical books are "the *Gospel* and the *Treasure of Life*, the *Pragmateia* and the *Book of the Mysteries*, the *Book of the Giants* and the *Epistles*, the *Psalms and the Prayers of my Lord*," followed by the *Image* and other texts, while the two references to Mani's scriptures given in the Coptic *Psalms* (*Sarakoton* 2,[4] and Bema Psalms)[5] refer to ⲡⲥⲛⲉⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲯⲁⲗⲙⲟⲥ "the two Psalms." Moreover, in the list in the third article of the Chinese *Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light*, after the *Epistles* the *Prayers* are mentioned, quoted in Chinese script as 阿拂胤 *a-fu-yin*, which represents Middle Persian *āfrīn* "blessing."[6]

Although none of Mani's prayers can be identified, a caption in a Sogdian text in Sogdian script establishes that a long hymn-cycle called

---

[1] During the compilation of the final version of the present paper I greatly benefited from Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst's (*Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Turfanforschung*) collaboration and work on these texts, in view of a full edition of the fragments of the Middle Iranian versions of Mani's Psalms which we are preparing, and which will soon be published (Durkin-Meisterernst & Morano forthc.). To him and to all the staff of the *Akademienvorhaben Turfanforschung* my warmest thanks for the kind hospitality they gave me in Berlin. I am very grateful to the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy and to the *Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz* for their kind permission to consult and edit the Turfan fragments of their collection.

[2] On the Manichaean canonical scriptures see Haloun & Henning 1952, 204ff., Boyce 1968, 69–71.

[3] See Pedersen 2006, 25.

[4] Allberry 1938, 140.6.

[5] Allberry 1938, 47.1.

[6] Haloun & Henning 1952, 208. Middle Persian *āfrīn* is the technical literary term closest to Parthian *āfrūwan*, see Sundermann 1985, 594. The headline of M209/V/, *ʾfry(n)[*, a manuscript containing a Middle Persian translation of a hymn from one of Mani's Psalms, proves that this was the Middle Persian term for Mani's Psalms.

Wuzurgān Āfrīwan "The Blessings of the Great Ones,"[7] was composed by Mani. The text runs as follows[8]

So14570/R/

Headline in Verso: *ʾymyn ʾʾxy-nt*

/4/ {red} *rty pty-ʾmty ʾz-wʾntʾk*
/5/ {red} *γrʾywy 12 ʾnδmʾkw xwy-ckʾwy*
/6/ {red} *ZY ʾʾγšt wz-ʾrkʾn ʾʾpry-wn*
/7/ {blank}
/8/ *ʾynʾk xcy ʾʾpry-wnh*
/9/ *cw ZY ʾʾpry-tδʾrt ʾxw*
/10/ *xwtʾw ʾyšw ʾz-γʾnt mr*
/11/ *mʾny ktxw pr rxwšny*[9]
/12/ *ʾz-nyʾ z-ʾwr ʾwstʾt* °°
/13/ *rty ZKw kwcʾkh pr γwβtyʾ*
/14/ *pwrnw kwntʾ r(t)y wyʾβr ZY*
/15/ *wʾnkw wʾβ* °°

/4/ and the 12 cantos of the *Explanation of the*
/5/ *Living Soul* are (also) completed
/6/ and begun is the *Blessing of the Great Ones*.
/7/ {*blank*}
/8/ This is the Blessing
/9/ which the Apostle
/10/ of the Lord Jesus Mār
/11/ Mānī prayed, when he was established
/12/ in the power of the Light-Knowledge.
/13/ And he filled his mouth with praise and
/14/ speech and
/15/ after this manner said:

---

[7] For a discussion on the possible meaning of this title see Morano 2005, 277, and Durkin-Meisterernst & Morano (forthcoming).

[8] The entire sheet is published in Morano 2005, 281 ff. For previous quotations of the caption see Reck 2006, nr. 171.

[9] Mistakenly printed *rxwšny* in Morano 2005, 281.

The importance of this text should not be underestimated for several reasons: it says that a Blessing named *Wuzurgān Āfrīwan* starts in the following lines (line /6/); it establishes that this Blessing was composed by Mani (lines /8–11/); the first words of the text after the caption, *ʾyn'k xcy*, "This is," are the Sogdian translation of the Parthian phrase *ʿymyn ʾhynd*, "These are," which appears in the headline on the Verso of the manuscript itself and constitutes the Parthian title of the first canto[10] of the Blessing. Another manuscript, from the same book, also containing the Sogdian version of *Wuzurgān Āfrīwan*, So14444, bears a headline V/R *ʾ(y)m'yn ʾʾxy-nt / wz'rk'n ʾʾprywn*, "These are / Blessings of Great Ones," and has, in its Recto, ll. 2–3,[11] a caption, written in red ink, in which it is stated that the first canto ends and the second begins:

/V/2/ *pty-'mty sryk 'nδmy wz-'rk'n*
/V/3/ 𐫁𐫀𐫆 𐫀𐫆𐫂𐫑 𐫄𐫀𐫆𐫑𐫐𐫀𐫅 𐫀𐫄𐫀𐫆𐫑𐫐'𐫑

/V/2/ the first canto of "[The Blessings] of the Great Ones" is finished
/V/3/ and the second canto has begun.

It is then certain that the first canto was named *ʿymyn ʾhynd*, and that the name of the canto was taken from the opening Parthian words of the canto itself,[12] from which the Sogdian version was evidently translated. The original Parthian of the beginning of this canto, with its opening words *ʿymyn ʾhynd*, can in fact be reconstructed from several manuscripts in Manichaean and Sogdian script from the Berlin Turfan collection.

Two fragments in Manichaean script, M608b and M895b, form together, without joining directly, part of a loose page, which probably never belonged to a book but was used as a practice sheet:[13]

---

[10] Line /5/ of the text informs us that the long hymn-cycles were subdivided into *ʾnδm'k*, lit. "limbs," see Morano 2005, 279–281, where all the headlines of the mss containing the Sogdian version of the *Wuzurgān Āfrīwan* are listed.

[11] Published in Morano 2005, 279. See also Reck 2006, nr. 163.

[12] See Morano 2005, 281 with n. 8.

[13] In both fragments the lines are written inversely to those of the Verso, which has bits of lines in Manichaean script and a few letters in Sogdian script. Boyce 1960, 42 did not recognise that the two fragments belong together and did not assign M608b to the Psalms, and on 61 she gave no description of M895b, assigning it to the Psalms.

M608b ~ M895b *(see pl. 1)*

R/H/ ʿy(myn ʾ)[hynd]
R/1/ ʿymyn ʾhynd (ʾ)[frywn ° cy ʾfryd m](rym)[ʾ](ny °) fryštg cy yyšw
R/2/ mšyhʾh (°) pd bg[ʾn pydr kʾm ° kd ʾw wzr]gyft ° ʾwd hrwy(n šhr)ʾ (n rʾz)
R/3/ ʾbgws(t) [° cy bw](yd)bw(d)[ʾst ° ʾwd] (ʾ)c šhr(ʾn) ° (n)[gw](s)[t]
R/4/ [ʾhynd ʾbdyš](t) ° ʾb(r šh)[rʾn rwšnʾn rʾz ° ʾ](wd) ʾ(br tʾrygʾn šhrʾ) [n rʾz]
{lines missing}

Another fragment from (the same?) loose practice sheet contains traces of the beginning of the word *ʾfrywn* and the first six words of the Psalm written in big characters, leaving the rest of the sheet blank.[14] The Verso of all three fragments has bits of lines in Manichaean script and letters in Sogdian script.

M895e *(see pl. 1)*

R/1/ (ʾf)[rywn?]
R/2/ ʿymyn ʾ(h)[yn]d ʾf(r)ywn cy ʾfryd mry(m)[ʾny]
{rest blank}

Two joined fragments[15] written on the Verso of a Chinese scroll contain, after 8 lines of a concluding part of a caption[16] and two blank lines, the Parthian text in Sogdian script of the beginning of the Psalm:

Ch/So20501/V/ + Ch/U6546/V/ *(see pl. 2)*

V/1/ prʾy(.)[15–17]
V/2/ krʾ [17–18]

---

[14] In this fragment also the text is written inversely to that of the Verso, but the handwriting is different from that of M608b and M895b.

[15] See Reck 2006, nr. 339. I am grateful to Christiane Reck for having pointed out these fragments to me long before the publication of her catalogue. The two fragments join in line /14/ *wz-rkyβ](t) °° (ʾ)[wδ*.

[16] The text is too fragmentary to attempt a running translation. The word *rwz-ʾk* (*rwcg*) "fast" in l. /7/ seems to relate these texts to the Fast ceremony.

V/3/ ʾz-βʾʾn(h) (rʾ)[št 12–14]
V/4/ ʾym ʾʾβry-wʾn(h)[.](.)[5–7]
V/5/ (ʾw)δ kʾmʾyδ rwz-ʾn[.....](.) ny
V/6/ [...](ʾn) °° ws yʾwr (.)[....]n °° ʾyʾn
V/7/ [...](. yʾ)wr °° (p)[w]ʾδ rwz-ʾk °° xyβ
V/8/ [pwy](δ) ✤
V/9/ {blank}
V/10 {blank}
V/11/ ʾymyn ʾʾxynt ʾʾβry-wʾnh °° cy
V/12/ [ʾʾβr](yδ) (mrm)ʾny °° βrʾyštʾk cy ʾyšw
V/13/ [mšyx](ʾ) °° pδ [bγʾn py](δr) (k)ʾm °° kδ
V/14/ [ʾwʾ wz-rkyβ](t) °° (ʾ)[wδ xrwy](n) šxrʾn
V/15/ rʾz ʾβγʾwst °° (c)[y pwyδ pw](δ)
V/16/ ʾst °° ʾwδ ʾz šx(rʾn) °° nγws(t)
V/17/ ʾʾxynt ʾβδʾy-st °° ʾβr šx(r)[ʾn]
V/18/ rwšnʾn rʾz °° ʾβr tʾrʾkʾn šxrʾn
V/19/ rʾz °° ʾwδ ʾβr wymyxtkʾn šxrʾn
V/20/ [wr]δyšn nmʾδ °° ʾwδ kδ ʾymyn °°
V/21/ [nγws]tky-βt ʾβγwst °° ʾδyʾn
V/22/ [ʾymyn ʾʾβry-wʾn ʾʾβryδ] ʾw wz-rkyβ-t xwδʾ(yʾ)
V/23/ [ʾwδ ʾw wysp̄ʾn](h) pyδrʾn °° ʾymyn
{lines missing}

Combining the texts given in the aforementioned fragments (M895e/R, M608b/R ~ M895b/R, Ch/So20501/V + Ch/U6546/V), the Parthian version of the beginning of the first canto of the *Wuzurgān Āfrīwan* can be reconstructed as follows:

/H/ ʿy(myn ʾ)[hynd]

ʿymyn ʾhynd ʾfrywn ° cy ʾfryd mrymʾny ° cy fryštg cy yyšwʿ mšyhʾẖ ° pd bgʾn pydr kʾm ° kd [ʾwʾ] wzrgyft ° ʾwd hrwyn šhrʾn rʾz ʾbgws(t) ° [cy bw](yd)bw(d) ʾst ° ʾwd ʾc šhrʾn ° ngwst ʾhynd ʾbdyšt ° ʾbr šhrʾn rwšnʾn rʾz ° ʾbr tʾrygʾn šhrʾn rʾz ° ʾwd ʾbr wmyxtgʾn šhrʾn [wr]dyšn nmʾd ° ʾwd kd ʿymyn ° [ngws]tgyft ʾbgwst ° ʾdyʾn [ʿymyn ʾfrywn ʾfryd] ʾw wzrgyft xwdʾyʾ [ʾwd ʾw wysp̄ʾn] pydʾrʾn ° ʿymyn [...]

Translation:

"These a[re]…"

"These are the Blessings which Mār Mānī, by the will of the Father of Gods apostle of Jesus Christ, recited, when he revealed [the] Greatness and the mystery of the worlds [that will b]e, were, (and) are, and showed (things that) were hidden to the worlds: he showed concerning the mystery of the Light Worlds, concerning the mystery of the Dark Worlds, and concerning the turning(?) of the mixed worlds. And when he revealed these [hidden] things, then [he praised this blessing] to the Lord of Greatness [and to all the] fathers: these […]"

Commentary:

– *mrym'ny fryštg cy yyšw' mšyh'ẖ ° pd bg'n pydr k'm*: the usual initial formula found in Mani's works recalls the incipit of the *Living Gospel* (M17/V/i/12ff. = M644/A/4–5): *'n m'ny prystg 'yg yyšw' 'ry'm'n pd q'm 'y pdr by w'bryg'n* "I Mani, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of the Father, the true God";[17] cf. also in the *Epistula Fundamenti*, "Manichaeus apostolus Iesu Christi prouidentia dei patris."

– *['w?] wzrgyft ° 'wd hrwyn šhr'n r'z 'bgws(t) ° [cy bw](yd)bw(d) 'st* "he revealed [the] Greatness and the mystery of the worlds [that will b]e, were, (and) are": here the two principles and the three times (primeval separation, mixture, and *apokatastasis*) are mentioned. The brachylogical, asyndetic expression *cy bwyd bwd 'st*, lit. "that will be, was, is,"[18] here in the singular, may grammatically refer to *r'z*: the mystery of the future worlds, the mystery of the primeval worlds, and the mystery of the present world.

– *'wd 'c šhr'n ° ngwst 'hynd 'bdyšt* "and showed [things that were] hidden to the worlds"; the sense of this part of the sentence seems to be that Mani has revealed things that were previously hidden to the world. If this is correct, a passage of the Gospel of Matthew can be compared:

[17] See MacKenzie 1994, 191.

[18] We should rather expect, in succession, "that were, are, and will be." At this point the text in all the manuscripts is damaged, and this is only a tentative restoration. In the corresponding Middle Persian text, see below M379b/R/15/, we have, however, *'y b(w) y(d b)[*, which seems to agree with the proposed emendation of the Parthian text.

Mt 13:35 – "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world (κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου)."

Middle Persian version

The beginning of the Middle Persian version of the text can be found, after a preceding text with final formula ("for ever and ever may it be so") and a blank line, in M379b, a tiny and narrow almost entirely preserved sheet.

M379b *(see pl. 3 and 4)*

R/1/ [……](t)wʾn[….]
R/2/ [……](ʾ)yʾb […….](šn)
R/3/ […….](h) chʾ(r)[…..] °
R/4/ […… xw](r)xšyd u mʾ(h) °
R/5/ […….] (mn) ʾstʾr
R/6/ […….](š) bwxtgyh
R/7/ […ʾw pr]ʾzyšt u jʾydʾn
R/8/ [zmʾn ʾwh] byh ° ° ° °
R/9/ {blank}
R/10/ [ʿyn ʾst] ysn ʿy yšt m(r)[mʾny]
R/11/ [prystg]ʿy yyšwʿ ʾr(y)[ʾmʾn]
R/12/ [pd kʾm](y)šn ʿy by zr(w)ʾ[n kʾ]
R/13/ [ʾw] (w)zrgyh ° u n(h)[w](p)[tgyh ʿy]
R/14/ [šhrʾ](n) ʾbhwpt ° ʾ(m)[wxt?…]
R/15/ [….](k/x..)ʾn ʿy b(w)y(d b)[wd ʾst]
R/16/ [ʾwd ʾz šhr]ʾn nhwpt h(y)[nd…..]
{end of page}

{beginning of page}
V/1/ n(h)[wpt h](y)nd °[……..]
V/2/ r(w)[šn wh]yštʾ(w)[° ʾwd ʾbr]
V/3/ [š](h)r tʾryg ° u (ʾ)[br]
V/4/ [š]hrʾn gwmyxtg[ʾn nmwd °]
V/5/ (kʾ) ʿymyn nhwpt(g)[yhʾn ʾbhwpt]

V/6/ (h)ynd ° ʾgyš ʿsṯʾ[yd]
V/7/ [ʿ](y)n ysn ʾw ʾwy xwd(ʾ)[y]
V/8/ [ʾwd ʾ]w wysp'n ny'g'(n)[…]
V/9/ […h]rw ky ʿymyn r'z(ʾ)[n….]
V/10 [….]° ʿymy<n> ʾndr ʾ(d/r/g)[….]
V/11/ [….]ʾbhwpt hynd (°)[…]
V/12/ […..] hyb yzyd u ʾb[r]
V/13/ [….](.)y(.) ° (u) hmys ʾw(.)[….]
V/14/ [….](.) ° ʿy[m](yn) bʾry(s)[t…]
V/15/ […(k/x)..]qyḥ ʾbzwʾ(d)[…..]
{end of page}

R/1/ [……..] thy/power [……]
R/2/ [……..] or […….]
R/3/ [……..] four[…..]
R/4/ [……the S]un and the Moon.
R/5/ [……..] my sins
R/6/ [……..] salvation
R/7/ […for ev]er and eternally
R/8/ may it be [so].
R/9/ {*blank*}
R/10/ [This is] the Blessing recited by Mār[Mānī],
R/11/ [the Apostle] of Jesus Ary[āmān]
R/12/ [by the wish] of God Zurwā[n, when]
R/13/ [the] Greatness and the secret [things]
R/14/ [of the worlds] he revealed. He tau[ght?…]
R/15/ [….] which will be [were and are]
R/16/ [and which] were hidden [from the worlds]
{*end of page*}

{beginning of page}
V/1/ were hidden.[19] [He showed on…]
V/2/ [Light Pa]radise [and on the]
V/3/ dark [wo]rld, and [on the]
V/4/ mixed [wo]rlds.
V/5/ When these hidden things were revealed,

[19] See the last line of the Recto. This line was probably copied twice by the scribe.

V/6/ then he prai[sed]
V/7/ [th]is blessing to the Lord
V/8/ [and] to all Ancestors[…]
V/9/ […] all those who […] these mysteries.
V/10/ Those in [….]
V/11/ [.….]are revealed.
V/12/ [.….] may ye recite and upon
V/13/ [……]. And together to [….]
V/14/ [……]. These highest […]
V/15/ [….] may increase/ be added to [.….]
{*end of page*}

As the following interlinear text will show, it is apparent that the Middle Persian text runs almost parallel with the Parthian, from which it was probably translated:

Pth. – */H/ ʿy(myn ʾ)[hynd]*

¶
• Pth. – ʿymyn ʾhynd ʾfrywn ° cy ʾfryd mrymʾny ° cy fryštg cy yyšwʿ mšyhʾh ° pd bgʾn pydr kʾm °
• MP – *[ʿyn ʾst] ysn ʿy yšt m(r)[mʾny prystg] ʿy yyšwʿ ʾr(y)[ʾmʾn pd kʾm](y) šn ʿy by zr(w)ʾ[n*

In all three versions (Sogd.: *ʾynʾk xcy ʾʾpry-wnh cw ZY ʾʾpry-tδʾrt*, see above) the *figura etymologica* "the blessing which [Mār Mānī] blessed" is maintained. In the Middle Persian translation the term *ysn*, from Av. *yasna-* "Verehrung, Anbetung, Huldigung, Preis, Gebet,"[20] has perhaps a Zoroastrian flavor.

¶
• Pth. – kd [ʾw?] wzrgyft ° ʾwd hrwyn šhrʾn rʾz ʾbgws(t) °
• MP – *kʾ ʾw] (w)zrgyh ° u n(h)[w](p)[tgyh ʿy šhrʾ](n) ʾbhwpt °*

[20] Bartholomae 1904, 1270.

¶
• Pth. – [cy bw](yd)bw(d) ʾst ° ʾwd ʾc šhrʾn ° ngwst ʾhynd ʾbdyšt °
• MP – *ʾ(m)[wxtʔ……..](k/x..)ʾn ʿy b(w)y(d b)[wd ʾst ʾwd ʾz šhr]ʾn nhwpt h(y)[nd…..] {n(h)[wpt h](y)nd °}*

n(h)[wpt h](y)nd °, in the first line of the Verso, is perhaps a case of dittography and must be expunged. If this is the case, the sheet is complete.

¶
• Pth. – ʾbr šhrʾn rwšnʾn rʾz ° ʾbr tʾrygʾn šhrʾn rʾz ° ʾwd ʾbr wmyxtgʾn šhrʾn [wr]dyšn nmʾd °
• MP – *[……..] r(w)[šn wh]yštʾ(w)[° ʾwd ʾbr š](h)r t̲ʾryg ° u (ʾ)[br š]hrʾn gwmyxtg[ʾn nmwd]*

¶
• Pth. – ʾwd kd ʿymyn ° [ngws]tgyft ʾbgwst ° ʾdyʾn [ʿymyn ʾfrywn ʾfryd] ʾw wzrgyft xwdʾyʾ [ʾwd ʾw wyspʾn] pydʾrʾn ° ʿymyn […]
• MP – *(kʾ) ʿymyn nhwpt(g)[yhʾn ʾbhwpt] (h)ynd ° ʾygyš ʿst̲ʾ[yd ʾ](y)n ysn ʾw ʾwy xwd(ʾ)[y ʾwd ʾ]w wyspʾn nyʾgʾ(n)[……h]rw ky ʿymyn*

¶
• Pth. – lost
• MP – *rʾz(ʾ)[n….] V/10 [….]° ʿymy<n> ʾndr ʾ(d/r/g)[….] V/11/ [….] ʾbhwpt hynd (°)[…] V/12/ […..] hyb yzyd u ʾb[r] V/13/ [….](.)y(.) ° (u) hmys ʾw(.)[….] V/14/ [….](.) ° ʿy[m](yn) bʾry(s)[t…] V/15/ [..(k/x)..] qyh̲ ʾbzwʾ(d)[…..]*

Bibliography

Allberry, C. R. C.
1938 *A Manichaean Psalm-Book. Part II*, Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection 2 (Stuttgart).
Bartholomae, Ch.
1904 *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (Straßburg).
Boyce, M.
1960 *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichean Script in the German Turfan Collection* (Berlin).
1968 The Manichaean Literature in Middle Iranian, *Handbuch der Orientalistik* Abt. I, Bd 4., Abschn. 2., Lief. 1, (Leiden), 67–76.
Durkin-Meisterernst, D. and E. Morano
forthc. *Mani's Psalms. Edition of the Middle Persian, Parthian and Sogdian fragments in the Turfan Collection*, Berliner Turfantexte (Turnhout).
Haloun, G. and W. B. Henning
1952 Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light, *Asia Major* 3: 184–212.
MacKenzie, D. N.
1994 'I, Mani…', *Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65. Geburtstag*, H. Preißler & H. Seiwert, eds. (Marburg), 183–198.
Morano, E.
2005 A Manichaean *Oratio Dominica*, *Il Manicheismo. Nuove propettive della richerca. Atti del Quinto congresso internazionale di studi sul manicheismo. Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale", Napoli, 2–8 Settembre 2001*, Manichaean Studies 5, A. Van Tongerloo & L. Cirillo, eds. (Turnhout), 277–285, 432–433 (plates).
Pedersen, N. A. (ed.)
2006 *Manichaean Homilies. With a number of hitherto unpublished fragments. Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum Series Coptica II*, Turnhout.
Reck, Ch.
2006 *Mitteliranische Handschriften Teil 1: Berliner Turfanfragmente manichäischen Inhalts in soghdischer Schrift*, VOHD XVIII, 1, (Stuttgart).
Sundermann, W.
1985 Āfurišn, *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (London), Vol. I, 593–594.

A SOGDIAN VERSION OF MANI'S *LETTER OF THE SEAL*

Christiane Reck
Berlin

During my work on the catalogue of the Middle Iranian fragments in Manichaean script,[1] I came across a glass plate with ten fragments more or less damaged by worm eating: So 14150 – So 14159.[2] The label of the find site shows T II D 91, indicating that it was found during the second expedition in Dakianussahr = Qočo (Gaochang).[3] At first sight three fragments seem to have the same shape. The other fragments also show similarities. I was able, therefore, to arrange the fragments into two groups. A reading of the text confirmed this arrangement. The first group of fragments contains Sogdian text (So 14150, So 14151, So 14153, So 14156, and So 14159). The other group of fragments contains Middle Persian and Parthian text in Sogdian script (So 14152, So 14152a, So 14154, So 14155, So 14157, So 14158). I was able to identify some of these pieces as parts of Bema hymns.[4] Two of these hymns are part of the well known Manichaean book of prayer and confession, the so called "Bet- and Beichtbuch" (BBB) edited by W. Henning.[5] This part of the manuscript containing the Bema hymns has been published recently.[6]

But the other group of fragments with Sogdian text was difficult to classify. Some verbal endings in the second plural form indicated that the text is addressed to the Manichaean community. The text was possibly composed by Mani himself. Comparing the text with the part

---

[1] This is an enlarged version of the paper presented at the the "2005 International Symposium on Turfanological Studies, Turfan, Xinjiang/China" (Reck 2006b) and additionally at the "Sixth International Meeting of the International Association of Manichaean Studies." Here the complete transliteration and translation of the Sogdian text is added including the new results by E. Morano.

[2] Reck 2006a, 95–101 (ns. 114–124).

[3] This plate can be viewed in the Digital Archive of the Turfanforschung: http://www.bbaw.de/forschung/turfanforschung/dta/so/images/so14150so14159_seite1.jpg

[4] Reck 2004, 46–48 (hymns J, K, Z and AH).

[5] Henning 1936.

[6] Reck 2007, 318–327.

of the *Letter of the Seal*, which is also part of the book of prayer and confession (BBB) mentioned above,[7] I found the following correspondences: M 801a/I/r–v/4/ (BBB 18, ll. 1–22) = So 14150 + So 14156 ~ So 14152 I/r–v/9/ (pl. 1). Unfortunately no title is preserved. We do not know whether this manuscript had headlines at all. But the occurrence of this text in combination with the hymns identified with Bema hymns allows us to assume that it can be the *Letter of the Seal* in a Sogdian translation.

The *Letter of the Seal* was the last letter Mani wrote in prison before his death. It is his legacy sent to his adherents. It is mentioned in a report about his death, M 454 I/r/12–13/, as frwrdg ʿy mwhr.[8] The Middle Persian text in the BBB is the final part of the beginning of the letter which ends after the list of the people being addressed, in the course of which. Mani mentions the whole Manichaean community. The Sogdian text continues the letter, but it is unfortunately very badly preserved. As a result of the comparison of both texts, which differ in the preserved parts only in very few cases, one can state that only a few lines, two or three, are missing. So 14156 and So 14159 preserve the lower margin. For this reason, one can conclude that on the upper part of the fragments at least two lines, at most three lines are completely missing. We deduce from this that one page had 18 lines. The length of each line was approximately 4,5 cm.

Besides these fragments of the *Letter of the Seal* we know two fragments where the word mwhr, "Seal" appears in the headline, M 720c/2.S./ (Manichaean script) and So 18151/verso/ (Sogdian script). The last fragment belongs together with So 18056 and contains the doxology and the beginning of the *Living Gospel*. One line is missing between the two fragments. It is not clear why the word mwhr is mentioned here.

But there is also another fragment, M 1313[9] (pl. 4), which Henning already identified as preserving the very beginning of the *Letter of the Seal*.[10] It starts with the words: "Mani, apostle of Jesus Aryāmān,…" It is nearly the same beginning as in the *Living Gospel*, which starts

[7] Henning 1936, 18, facsimile: Weber 2000, Pls. 102 and 103 (M 801a folio I). See BBB, 18, n. 4 and commentary 8–9. Henning assumed that it is the final part. But as W. Sundermann wrote in "Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer I," 86, it is obviously the final part of the opening salutation only.

[8] Andreas / Henning 1934, 891, commented on by Sundermann 1981, 135, text 24.3.

[9] Boyce 1960, 69.

[10] Haloun / Henning 1953, 20, n. 6.

with "I, Mani, the Apostle of Jesus,…" In the *Letter of the Seal* we miss the Initial "I." This opening formula is also well attested in fragments of one or more canonical epistles of the Kellis papyri,[11] for example: "Manichaios, apostle of Jesus Chrestos, and all the brothers who are with me; to N.N., my loved one, and all the brothers who are with you, each one according to his name."[12]

Comparing this with the text given below, we find some similarities. But the formula used in the Middle Persian and Sogdian texts here is more extended and comprises the whole Manichaean community. What is missing is the formula "Peace through God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Chrestos…" as it is quoted in a Coptic letter.[13] The verso of M 1313 has the same text as BBB, but adds in line v/9/ one word nywš̌-g'n, "hearer" as Henning already ascertained there (n. 8), and which is confirmed also in the Sogdian text here: nγwš̌'kt (So 14150+/r/14/). The Sogdian text seems to include ['rt](wt), "righteous" as well, as Henning had assumed in the lacuna of line /9/. This word cannot be found in M 1313. Before starting the *Letter of the Seal* some defective lines are preserved in this fragment finishing with the words: r/5/ (h) n(j)f̲t̲ 'wnglywnyg b'š['h̲], "Finished is the hymn on the *Living Gospel*." The fact that we find at least two times both texts mentioned in the same fragments underlines a close relation between the *Living Gospel* and the *Letter of the Seal*. The fragment M 1313 is under glass with M 1312. Both fragments belong with a number of others, for example M 52 and M 61, to the same manuscript.[14] This manuscript includes many cantillated hymns. The fact that it contains also the *Letter of the Seal* increases the importance of this hymn book, which is still awaiting systematic research.

I am very grateful to Enrico Morano who discovered that the two fragments M 1312 and M 1313 belong to one page (pl.4). He kindly allowed me to use his reading and interpretation of M 1312 and gave me some other additions and corrections. M 1312/r/ repeats the text of M 1313/r/10–13/ and M 1312/v/ that of M 1313/v/6–11/ in cantillated form. Both texts complete each other. In M 1313/v/1–5/ the text is also written in a kind of cantillated form. Presumable the text of these lines preceded in a non-cantillated form in that part of the

[11] Gardner 1997, 79–80, and Gardner 2001, 93–99.
[12] Gardner / Lieu 2004, 167.
[13] Gardner 2001, 96, and Gardner 2004, 167.
[14] Boyce 1960, 52, and Reck 2004, 14 n. 6.

page that is now lost. I therefore have been able to add this fragment to the compiled text below. Additionally Enrico Morano has informed me about the congruence of Otani 6151[15] with M 801a/I/r/9–18/. Obviously the first three lines of Otani 6151 are written in cantillated form as the long lines between the letters and the use of δ instead of d makes clear.[16] It seems to employ the same system of alternation of cantillated and non-cantillated text found in M1312 and M 1313. But the handwriting of Otani 6151 is bigger than that of M 1312 and M 1313. The distance between the lines is 0,9 cm, against less than 0,7 in M 1312 and M 1313. The backside of Otani is not visible because it is glued on a board. It seems to be empty. So the fragments cannot have belonged to the same manuscript.

Combined text of the beginning of the Mani's Letter of the Seal
(M 1312 ~ M 1313, M 801a/I/, So 14150 + So 14156 ~ So 14152 I/ and Otani 6151)

M 1313/r/9/ *nwyst mwhr dyb(.)*[ ][17]
It has begun the Letter of the Seal

M 1312/r/3–5/ /3/ [fry]-stg ~~(y)-(y)[šwʿ] /4/ [ʾ-]ryʾ[-](m)ʾn ⊙ (m)[w-rzy- /5/ [-](y)-dg--
M 1313/r/10–12/ /10/ mʾny frystg yy[šwʿ] /11/ ʾryʾmʾn mwrzyd(g)[18]
Mani, the apostle of Je[sus] Aryāmān, the persecuted

M 1312/5–7/ (ʿyr)-(pʾ-y) /6/[-ʾ](n)[19] nʾ-m ⊙ ʾ-[z] /7/ [šhry-ʾ-]rʾ-n ⊙ (ʾy)[g šhr]
M 1313/r/11–12/
+M 1312/r/1–2/ [ʿyr]/12/ [pʾy](ʾn n)ʾm ʾ(z[20] š)[hryʾrʾn] /2/ [ʿy](g) šhr ⊙⊙

---

[15] Kudara / Sundermann / Yoshida 1997, text volume, 175, and facsimile volume, 100.
[16] This fact is noted in the edition as well. I thank Kasai Yukiyo for her translation.
[17] Incipit, written with red ink. The b has two diacritical dots.
[18] See Henning 1943, 67 n. 1.
[19] The reconstruction is not sure, because the remaining lower parts of the letters do not clearly show the r. Usually ʾyrpʾyʾn is written with initial <ʾ>, Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, 81. But one can read clearly ʿ here, see ʿyr "lower", Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, 99.
[20] M 1312/r/1/ shows the very lowest part of the z.

M 801a/I/r/1/ /1/ ʿyg šhr ⊙⊙
So 14150+/r/4–5/ /4/ (ʾs.)[8](.) ZY MN (ʾβc)ʾnp[δy] /5/ (ʾ)[xšʾw](n)δʾrty[21] ⊙⊙ ⊙⊙
[of spurned] name by the rulers of the world.

M 801a/I/r/1–2/ ʾwd ʾmw /2/ pws ʿym d[wšysṯ]
M 1313/v/1–2/ /1/ [ʾwd ʾ](mw)~[22] (p)[ws] /2/ [ʿym δ](w)-šy-s[ṯ ʾwδ]
So 14150+/r/5–6/ rty /6/ [MN ʾm](w) mnʾ βry z-ʾtʾkw
And from Ammo (?), this most beloved son

M 801a/I/r/3–5/ /3/ ʾwd ʾc wys[p]ʾn /4/ przyndʾn dwšysṯʾn /5/ ʿym ʾbʾg hynd
M 1313/v/3–6/ /3/ [ʾ-c w](y)sp(ʾ)-(n)[przy-nδ ʾ-n] /4/ (dw)-šy-(s)[tʾ-ʾ-n] /5/ [ʿy](m) ⊙
ʾbʾ-(g)[23] /6/ [hy-nd]
So 14150+/r/7–8/ /7/ [ZY MN](sγ)tmʾnw pry-t /8/ [ʾ](ʾ)[wn](t) ky tʾmʾ[24] prw /9/ [ʾsk](wʾnt)
and from all the very dear children, who are with (me).

M 801a/I/r/6–7/ /6/ ⊙⊙ ʾw wyspʾn šwbʾnʾn /7/ (h)mwcʾgʾn u [ʿ](s) psgʾn
M 1313/v/6–7/ ⊙⊙ ʾw wyspʾn /7/ [šw]bʾnʾn (h)mwcʾgʾn u /8/ [ʿ](s) psgʾn
M 1312/v/1–3/ /1/ [wyspʾn šwbʾ]nʾ~-(n) ⊙ (h)[mw- /2/ cʾ-g]ʾn ʾw~δ (ʾ)[-s /3/ psγ']n ⊙
So 14150+/r/9–10/ ⊙⊙ nyšty-ʾm kw /10/ [xwšpʾnyt] (m)w(ẓ)-ʾk(t)[25] [ʾβ] (tʾ)δʾnt
(I announce) to (all) (the) shepherds, (the) teachers and (the) bishops

M 801a/I/r/8–9/ /8/ ʾwd ʾw wyspʾn wcydgʾn /9/ (ʾ)[wd nywšʾgʾn
M 1313/v/8–9/ u ʾw wyspʾn /9/ [wcyd](gʾ)n ʾwd nywšʾgʾn[26]
M 1312/v/3–5/ ʾw-(δ) ʾ[w] /4/ [wy]-(sp)ʾ-n ⊙ w(c)ydg(ʾ-)[n] /5/ (ʾ)[w-] (δ) ny(-)w-š(ʾ)[-gʾ-n]

---

[21] M 1312/r/18/]rʾn makes it likely to reconstruct (š)[hryʾrʾn] in the Mp. text and (ʾ)[xʾʾw](n)δʾrty in the Sogdian text, as it was guessed by N. Sims-Williams.
[22] A special cantillation mark?
[23] The b has two diacritical dots.
[24] N. Sims-Williams gave me the hint that it is a mistake for δʾmʾ.
[25] All ẓ have two dots in this handwriting.
[26] See Haloun/Henning 1953, 207, n. 6. ll. r/9–10/ are transliterated. Henning has already considered that his reading in BBB, 18, should be changed into (ʾ)[wd nywšʾgʾn brʾd](r)[ʾn].

So 14150+/r/11–13/ /11/ [ZY s'ṭ '](nc)[mny x]wyš(ṭ)[rṭ Z](Y)[27] /12/ (w)ycty-ṭ ['rṭ](wṭ) [Z]Y
/13/ [n](γ)wš'kṭ
(and [the assembly of] (presbyters))and (all) the (righteous) elect and auditors,

M 801a/I/r/9–10/ br'd](r)['n] /10/ 'wd wx'ryn myh''n /11/ 'wd qyh'n
M 1313/v/10–11/ /10/ [br'dr]('n) u xw'ryn myh('n) /11/ ['wd](q)yh'n
M 1312/v/6/ [b]r'-(')[-δr'-'n]
Otani 6151/1–2/ /1/]-n (br')-['-δr'-'n[28] xw'ryn /2/[29] myh('n)] 'w-δ qy(-)[h'-n]
So 14150+/r/13–15/ [βr']trt /14/ [ZY xw'r](y-)št ⊙⊙ xwštrt /15/ [ZY kštr](ṭ') ⊙⊙
brothers and sisters, great and small ones,

M 801a/I/r/11–12/ hwrw'n'n[30] /12/ 'spwrg'r'n u r'st̲'n
M 1313/v/11–12/ hwrw('n)'n /12/ ['spw](rg')r'n u r'(st̲)['](n)
Otani 6151/3/ [hwrw'n'n 'sp](.)-'w-(...-)[31]⊙ r(g'-r'n) ['w-δ r'st'n]
So 14150+/r/15–17/ pry-(r)w('nt) /16/ ['](s)pwrnk'r(y)[t] [Z](Y) r(š)[ty](t) /17/ s'r ⊙⊙
the pious ones, perfect / who are perfecting and righteous (ones).

M 801a/I/r/13–14/ /13/ hrw ky 'yn myzdgṭ'cy /14/ 'c mn pdyrypṭ̲ h''d
Otani 6151/4/ [hrw ky 'yn myz](d)gṭ'cyy ⊙ 'c mn pdyryp(t)[h''d]
So 14150+/r/17–18/ s(γt)[m'n ky ZY] /18/ ['ynyy] mwẓ̲-ty [1/2 l.]
All of you, who have received this message from me

M 801a/I/r/15–16/ /15/ 'wd 'w 'yn ''pr'h̲ /16/ 'wd qyrbg qyrdg''n
Otani 6151/5/ ['wd 'w 'yn '']fr'h̲ 'wd kyrbg kyrdg('n)[
and who have been content with this teaching and these pious deeds,

---

[27] Completion N. Sims-Williams.

[28] In Kudara / Sundermann / Yoshida, text volume, 175 ['](bd')[g'n?] was suggested.

[29] For this and the following lines of Otani 6151 it must be noted that it is not known where the beginnings and ends of the lines are situated.

[30] Elision of ' marked by two dots.

[31] In Kudara / Sundermann / Yoshida, text volume, 175 is written:]n ⊙ 'w-(δ'-)⊙ rg(-...')[.

M801a/I/r/17–v/1/ /17/ ʿymyš ncyst /18/ hwnsnd bwd hʾd ʾwd /v/1/ ʾbybxtgyh pd
Otani/6151/6/ [ʿymyš ncyst] (h)wnsnd bwd hʾd ʘ ʾwd[
So 14150+/v/4–5/ /4/ ky pry-βyrw ʘʘ [xwsʾn]tyʾ /5/ ʾkrty xʾt[32] ʘʘ ʘ[ʘ rty](p)w
that I have taught (you), who are without doubt

M 801a/I/v/2–3/ /2/ [w]r[wyšn] hwstygʾʾn /3/ hʾd ʘ (ks) ks pd xwyš nʾm
So 14150+/v/6–9/ /6/ δβmʾnkyʾ pr wr(n)[w] /7/ xwyz-y ptšprty[x](ʾt)[33] /8/ mrt mrt p(r) [xypδ] /9/ nʾm ʘʘ
very strongly established in the faith, to everyone personally.

M 801a/I/v/4/ *ptymṯ mwhr dyb*[34]
Finished is the Letter of the Seal

Here the duplicates finish. We have to find other hints to reconstruct the original order of the next two leaves. There are remains of the Sogdian text on the fragments So 14152, So 14155, and So 14158. Unfortunately it is impossible to join these small remains with the other fragments of the Sogdian text. But it seems likely that all belonged to three sheets. I have checked several combinations and found that one word (pw) of pw δβmʾnkyʾ, which I conjectured in the text of the *Letter of the Seal* (So 14150+So 14156/v/5/) was found on this small part (So 14152 I/v/5), so one can assume that both fragments belong together. Then I found another possible combination: δʾrδʾ skwnw (So 14158 II/v/5/-So 14153/v/5/). In addition to these combinations one has to consider the fact that So 14152a was removed from So 14152. Their former position gives a hint which pages could have followed each other. Now we can assume that the fragments were in this order:

1. folio (Pl. 1):
So 14150 + So 14156 ~ So 14152 I/: Sogdian Letter of the Seal
So 14152 II/: Middle Persian / Parthian Bema hymns

---

[32] Commentary by N. Sims-Williams: "xʾt ~ MP hʾd. Unless the translator misunderstood 2 pl. hʾd as 3 sg., the Sogdian must have changed the construction to an impersonal one. In that case one expects an obl. form of the 2 pl. pronoun, e.g. encl. –βn somewhere in the sentence." I think that the translator changed it by mistake by analogy to hʾd. But did he not understand the Sogdian text?

[33] See the previous note. It may be in this case, however, that the reconstruction is not correct.

[34] Explicit, written in red ink.

2. folio (Pl. 2):
So 14151 + So 14159 ~ So 14155 I/: Sogdian Letter of the Seal
So 14155 II/ + So 14157 + So 14152a: Middle Persian / Parthian Bema hymns

3. folio (Pl. 3):
So 14153 ~ So 14158 I/: Sogdian Letter of the Seal
So 14154 ~ So 14158 II/: Middle Persian Bema hymns

In this way we get a kind of continuous text of the Letter of the Seal. Unfortunately, we have no complete sentences. Because of this fact and of the lack of a parallel text, the transliteration is sometimes doubtful and the translation can be only provisional.

Transliteration and Translation

Remainder of 1. leaf: So 14150 + So 14156 ~ So 14152 I/v/, (Pl. 1):

/9/ ⊙⊙ (.)[2](.)[2]
/10/ ʾy(.)[4–5] MN [8]
/11/ [2–3](y)wʾn [2](.)[6]
/12/ (r/kʾ)[ ](.) ʾym ⊙⊙ ⊙[⊙]
/13/ ʾšmʾxw (.)[2](.) δymy-δ[2]
/14/ ʾβcʾnpδ sʾr ʾ(.)[8]
/15/ ʾ(kr)tym ⊙⊙ ʾš[mʾxw 4]
/16/ [2–3](.m.w) (.)[1](.) ptšʾ(..)[2]
/17/ [3](.)[6 (.)y ⊙⊙](.)[5]
/18/ [8]ʾkt(.k)[t 4]

/9/ . [ ]
/10/ …[ ]
/11/ …[ ]
/12/ …[ ] I am.
/13/ You…with this[ ]
/14/ to the world…[ ]
/15/ I became. Yo[u]
/16/ … … …[ ]
/17/ [ ].[ ]
/18/ [ ]

2. leaf: So 14151 ~ So 14159 ~ So 14155 I/, (Pl. 2):

r/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ]
/3/ [6](....) [5]
/4/ [5](kš)tʾy-ch ʾty(.)
/5/ (š)[3](t) βwδstn ⊙⊙ ⊙⊙
/6/ [2](.) xy-δ ʾxšy-wnʾkw
/7/ [3](.)[1]wʾnty zʾwr šmʾx
/8/ [ʾβcn](pδ) ẓ-wky-ʾ mscw
/9/ [6](.)[1](.)t ⊙⊙ ⊙⊙ rty-y
/10/ [6](w/p)r (w)[4](w)δ
/11/ [8]wʾt(.)[3–4]⊙⊙
/12/ (k)y sʾt[ ](.)[3–4]y
/13/ (βr)y-štyt[ ](p)tγwsty
/14/ [5–6](z)-nγ(..)[1](.) δʾrt ⊙⊙
/15/ [5]wʾnw[2](š)y-ʾ
/16/ (..)rwy δ(.)[ ](t) (k)t[3]
/17/ [4](...)[ ](.)[4](.)[3]
/18/ [4](..) (.)[1/2 l.]

v/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ]
/3/ [5](.)[>1/2 l.]
/4/ [3](.)t sʾr (.)[5]
/5/ [3](y) rʾmʾnt p(.)[3](⊙⊙) ⊙⊙
/6/ ptγwsty γrβʾk(y)[ʾ]
/7/ ZY mz-ʾyx(yʾ) ʾʾ[1](.)[3]
/8/ ʾwxmn/ʾy-δʾ ⊙⊙ ZY (..)[3]
/9/ wγrʾt(.)[1](..)[1/2 l.]
/10/ (x/γr)[4](.)[1/2 l.]
/11/ [1](.)[1–2] (6.)[4](...)[2–3]
/12/ (ʾ.y) (ʾ)[3](.)ẓ-kyšmʾ(.)
/13/ ptšmʾrδ[3]r kwnδʾ [2–3]
/14/ ZY pty(.)[ ](.) (⊙)[⊙ ⊙⊙]
/15/ (..)tyʾm (k)[2]šm(ʾ)[5]
/16/ [3]t [3]t mʾ[2]
/17/ [3](.)[3](xs)[4]
/18/ [6]r (ʾʾ/xšt)[4]

r/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ]
/3/ [ ]…[ ]
/4/ [ ] cornfield
/5/ [ ] garden.
/6/ [ ] the ruler himself
/7/ [ ]…the power you
/8/ the wor]ld health
/9/ [ ]. And
/10/ [ ]…[ ]…
/11/ [ ]…[ ].
/12/ who all [ ].
/13/ (ap)ostles concealed
/14/ [ ]…[ ] has.
/15/ [ ] so [ ]ship
/16/ …[ ]…[ ]
/17/ [ ]
/18/ [ ]

v/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ]
/3/ [ ]
/4/ [ ] to [
/5/ [ ] always [ ].
/6/ Concealed wisdo[m]
/7/ and greatness…[ ]
/8/ you…And [ ]
/9/ awake [ ]
/10/ …[ ]
/11/ …[ ]
/12/ …[ ]…[ ]
/13/ count/consider [ ]…you do [ ]
/14/ and…[ ].
/15/ …[ ] you [ ]
/16/ [ ]
/17/ [ ]
/18/ [ ]…[ ]

3. leaf: So 14153 ~ So 14158 I/, (Pl. 3):

r/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ]
/3/ (w..)[ ]
/4/ m'n(y) [3](.) β(..)yz (k/p.)
/5/ (.)[3](k)y' pryβyrw ⊙ L'
/6/ [4] m't kt 'šm'x
/7/ [C](W)RH cnn 'ptr'
/8/ [5](.)t ⊙⊙ kδ' šm'x
/9/ [2](p)[3](...)(r)ty-' wy-y
/10/ [1/2 l.] 'pt[r](y) (py)r'm
/11/ [5](.)'/nc[2](.) wβ/y'(p?)[1](.)⊙⊙ ⊙⊙
/12/ (k)t m'n cyw[4](.δ'.) m'x
/13/ [1](..)r βš'my[3](k)tβn
/14/ [5](c)y βwcytw ⊙⊙ ⊙⊙
/15/ [4 š]m'xw c'γ'z-y[1](.)
/16/ [1?](...) w(.)[4](..)[2–3]
/17/ [ ](..)[3]
/18/ [ ]

v/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ]
/3/ [ ](z)-prt
/4/ tnp'r ky pt(m)[wxt] δ'rδ'
/5/ skwnw ⊙⊙ ZY xypδ [3](.)
/6/ ZY 'ẓ-w'nt'k γr(')[yw 2–3?]
/7/ ky wysp(r)δy pt(m/rwγ.)[3]
/8/ 'sty ⊙⊙ pw prm'n[5]
/9/ skwnw ZY 'γ(.r.)[1]('r)[3]
/10/ rw(..)[1](.)[1]y-δ (c)[1/2 l.]
/11/ (.)[1–2]w'nkw [2]γ/x[5]
/12/ (t)[1](p/k)[1](..)[3]⊙⊙ ZY δywy(δ)
/13/ mz-'yxw '[4](.'r '')(z-prt)
/14/ 'nsδ' ⊙⊙ ZY mγ'[wnw 3]
/15/ (⊙)[⊙] (ZY) mγ'wn βγ(.)[5]
/16/ [2–3](m.)[3–4](δ')r γr'y/xr'y (.)[1]
/17/ [3–4](.)[>1/2 l.]
/18/ [ ]

r/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ]
/3/ [ ]
/4/ mind/monastery/Mani [ ]…
/5/ [ ]-ship/-dom I have explained. Not
/6/ [ ] was, that your
/7/ [Self]…from father
/8/ [ ]…, if you
/9/ [ ]…-ship/-dom his
/10/ [ ]…we believe
/11/ [ ]…they are
/12/ [ ]…mind (of this)…us/our
/13/ [ ]…escort/send[ ] if you
/14/ [ ]…O, I may/might save.
/15/ [ ]us…
/16/ [ ]…
/17/ [ ]…
/18/ [ ]

v/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ]
/3/ [ ]
/4/ body, which you have dre[ssed],
/5/ and the own [ ]
/6/ and living…[ ]
/7/ who is everwhere…[ ]
/8/ without mercy[ ]
/9/ makes and…[ ]
/10/ …[ ]
/11/ …so [ ]
/12/ …and with this [ ]
/13/ great…pure(?) [ ]
/14/ you are. And the whole [ ]
/15/ , and all…[ ]
/16/ … …mud [ ]
/17/ …[ ]
/18/ [ ]

Now we have the task of finding more fragments among the collections of Manichaean manuscripts which agree with the contents of these pages and could belong to the *Letter of the Seal* as well. The text of So 18140+So 13425(1) I/ and Ch/So 20507b could be similar to the *Letter of the Seal*. Unfortunately there are no textual correspondences. But both texts show the same missionary intention. The usage of the first person singular and the second person plural allow us assume that the texts are directed to an audience. In this sense they could also be homilies, of course. It is difficult to decide. But further research will clarify these questions. In his edition of fragments of the church history W. Sundermann published two Sogdian fragments, M 378 and M 410, with a direct speech by Mani.[35] He assumed that these are reports of Mani's disciples from their visits to Mani in prison. Maybe these are also parts of Mani's letter. Larry Clark and Jason BeDuhn have also called my attention to the Uigur fragment U 140, which they suggest could possibly belong to an Uigur version of the *Letter of the Seal*, because of its consolatory style.[36] Unfortunately no direct textual correspondence with the known fragments is evident.

As the result of the joining of the fragments we now have three folios of a book which preserves the *Letter of the Seal* in Sogdian on one side, and Middle Persian and presumably also Parthian Bema hymns on the other side. In this way it seems to be a kind of Sogdian copy of the "Bet- and Beichtbuch." We do not know how many folios are missing between the third and the fourth leaf. Moreover we do not know whether the hymns were preceding the *Letter of the Seal* or following it. According to the liturgical fragment M 5779, hymns are sung both before and after the reading of the *Letter of the Seal*. But one cannot identify one of the hymns quoted there with one of the hymns given in our fragments. Because two hymns could be identified with those following the reading of the *Letter of the Seal* in the BBB, I have decided to arrange the *Letter of the Seal* in front of the hymns. Unfortunately this disagrees with the quotation in my publication of the Bema hymns cited above. In any case, the designation of the first or second leaf of a folio (I or II) is not certain.

---

[35] Sundermann 1981, 137–139, texts 25.1 and 25.2, t. 78.

[36] The fragment was published by P. Zieme in 1970 and described by J. Wilkens in his catalogue, 152, nr. 139. In footnote 427, Wilkens assumes that it could be one of Mani's last sermons. L. Clark will present a new edition of the fragment forthcoming, where the order of the pages will be changed, with which I agree on the basis of formal aspects.

These new fragments of the *Letter of the Seal* open new possibilities for the identification of more parts of this letter. A more complete text would show us more of Mani himself in his last days. We would learn more about how he said farewell to his community. The fragments of our text demonstrate a very close relation between Mani and his disciples. The expression "Might/may I save…" (So 14153/r/14/) shows Mani's conviction that he was elected to save humankind. Last but not least, it is remarkable that the prose text is translated into Sogdian whereas the hymns are only transliterated. One could interpret this to mean that the understanding of such prose texts was more important to the members of the Manichaean community than it was in the case of the hymn texts.

Measurements of the manuscripts:
M 1312: 4,1 cm × 4,0 cm, r: 7 ll., v: 6 ll.
M 1313: 8, 2 cm × 5,5 cm, r: 9 ll., 3 ll. blank, v: 12 ll.
M 1313~M1312: approx. 12,0 cm × 6,0 cm, r: 18 ll. (ll. 6–8 blank, ll. 5 and 9 red), v: 18 ll.
So 14150: 10,2 cm × 6,6 cm, r: 15 ll., v: 15 ll.
So 14151: 9,8 cm × 6,0 cm, r: 15 ll., v: 15 ll.
So 14152: 9,1 cm × 6,0 cm, I: r: 3 ll., v: 3 ll., II: r: 12 ll., v: 12 ll.
So 14152a: 2,8 cm × 1,4 cm, r: 4 ll., v: 4 ll.
So 14153: 9,5 cm × 6,4 cm, r: 14 ll., v: 14 ll.
So 14154: 10,4 cm × 5,0 cm, r: 15 ll., v: 15 ll.
So 14155: 3,5 cm × 6,0 cm, I: r: 1 ll., v: 1 ll., II: r: 5 ll., v: 5 ll.
So 14156: 2,1 cm × 1,7 cm, r: 2 ll., v: 2 ll.
So 14157: 5,0 cm × 2,2 cm, r: 7 ll., v: 8 ll.
So 14158: 3,5 cm × 2,8 cm, I: r: 3 ll., v: 3 ll., II: r: 2 ll., v: 1 ll.
So 14159: 6,1 cm × 2,7 cm, r: 7 ll., v: 8 ll.

1. folio:
So 14150 + So 14156 ~ So 14152: approx.: 13,2 cm × 11,6 cm

2. folio:
So 14151 + So 14159 ~ So 14155 + So 14157 + So 14152a: approx.: 12 cm × 12,5 cm

3. folio:
So 14153 ~ So 14158 ~ So 14154: approx.: 11 cm × 13 cm

Bibliography

Andreas, F. C. and W. Henning
1934 *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan III*, SbPAW, Berlin.

Gardner, I.
1997 Personal letters from the Manichaean Community at Kellis, *Atti del Terzo Congresso Internazionale di Studi "Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico". Arcavacata di Rende – Amantea, 31 agosto – 5 settembre 1993*, Manichaean Studies 3, Luigi Cirillo and Alois van Tongerloo, eds. (Leuven), 77–94.
2001 The Reconstruction of Mani's *Epistles* from Three Coptic Codices (Ismant el-Kharab and Medinet Madi), *The Light and the Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies 50, Paul Mirecki and Jason BeDuhn, eds. (Leiden), 93–104.

Gardner, I. and S. N. C. Lieu
2004 *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire* (Cambridge).

Haloun, G. and W. Henning
1953 The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light, *Asia Major* 3: 184–212.

Henning, W.
1936 *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*, Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jg. 1936, Phil.-hist. Kl., Nr. 10 (Berlin).
1943 The Book of the Giants, *BSOAS* 11: 52–74.

Klimkeit, H.-J.
1993 *Gnosis on the Silk Road: Gnostic Texts from Central Asia* (San Francisco).

Reck, Ch.
2004 *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag: Manichäische Festtagshymnen. Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen*, Berliner Turfantexte 22 (Turnhout).
2006a *Mitteliranische Handschriften, Teil 1: Berliner Turfanfragmente manichäischen Inhalts in soghdischer Schrift*, Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, vol. XVIII,1 (Stuttgart).
2006b The Seed in the Field: The Sogdian Version of Mani's Letter of the Seal, *Tulufanxueyanjiu: Dierjie Tulufanxue Guojixueshuyantaohui Lunwenji*, Studia Turfanicum: Sammelband der Beiträge des Zweiten Internationalen Symposiums zur Turfanforschung, Turfan Antiquarian Bureau, ed. (Shanghai), 414–418.
2007 Tage der Barmherzigkeit: Nachträge zu den mitteliranischenmanichäischen Montags- und Bemahymnen, *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan: Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*, Iranica 13, M. Macuch, M. Maggi, W. Sundermann, ed. (Wiesbaden), 317–342.

Sundermann, W.
1981 *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts mit einem Appendix von N. Sims-Williams*, Berliner Turfantexte 11 (Berlin).

Weber, D.
2000 *Iranian Manichaean Turfan texts in publications since 1934: Photo Edition*, CII, Suppl. Series, vol. IV (London).

Wilkens, J.
2000 *Alttürkische Handschriften Teil 8: Manichäisch-türkische Texte der Berliner Turfansammlung*, Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, vol. XIII,16 (Stuttgart).

Zieme, P.
1970 Ein manichäisch-türkisches Fragment in manichäischer Schrift, *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 23.2: 157–165.

SNATCHES OF THE MIDDLE IRANIAN "TALE OF THE FIVE BROTHERS"

Christiane Reck
Berlin

Manichaean literature includes many tales used as parables to demonstrate dogmatics. They were intended to help the believers to understand the meaning of mythical events and ethical demands, and to act correctly. These parables are very often part of a didactic lecture, illustrating the aim of the speech in a metaphorical way. Unfortunately our stock of Manichaean literature is very defective. Therefore we know in only a few cases the context of the parable.[1] Nevertheless there are also collections of tales such as the Manichaean Parable book.[2] In most cases we cannot know whether the fragment was part of a collection of parables or part of a didactic speech. What we can observe is that most parables are closed with an epimythion identifying the persons and explaining their actions. These explanations give the Manichaean interpretation of the tales, sometimes borrowed from Indian or other traditions,[3] such as the famous story of the pearl-borer.[4] In the case of the following story a small part of the epimythion is preserved. But the epimythion usually follows the story. For this reason, I would like first to introduce the fragments, the preserved parts of the story, and so on. Afterwards we will learn the aim of the story by means of the epimythion.

The two badly damaged Sogdian fragments So 18058 and So 18197, which belong to the same manuscript, contain parts of one story. They can be joined in the way indicated below. So 18197 (16,0 cm × 9,2 cm) is the badly damaged remainder of a nearly complete sheet. It preserves small parts of the headlines and of lines 2–15. So 18058 (6,8 cm × 9,4 cm) is the lower part of this same sheet. It preserves lines 15–22. The joined piece is 18,2 cm × 9,4 cm. One can surmise

[1] Colditz 1987, 275.
[2] Sundermann 1985.
[3] See Wilkens 2003, 240–241, 253–254.
[4] Henning 1945, 465–469.

that this sheet originally contained 22 lines. The first line of the text is completely lacking. We see the end of a red headline with ornamental blossoms. On the verso side the headline begins with the number five, *pnc*. There are more fragments with a similar handwriting, although sometimes the letters are a little bit larger, or the distance between the lines is greater. We therefore have no other fragments that belong to precisely this hand.

Transliteration and Translation of So 18058 + So 18197 (See Pls. 1 and 2)

r/hl / [*](.) *
/1/ [ ]
/2/ [< l.] šw
/3/ [< l.]wδʾrt
/4/ [< l.]w
/5/ [< l.](š)y
/6/ [6](.)[ ](mr)w[1](.δ)[ʾr]t ❍❍
/7/ rty pcpʾty ʾy(w) myδδ (.)[4]
/8/ ʾXYW ʾẓ-γʾrt ʾrkw Lʾ [3–4]
/9/ kδʾrt ZY š(w) ywnʾyδδ pty-x(wʾy)
/10/ ❍❍ rtms w(ʾnt) ʾδry ʾXYW prymyδ
/11/ βrγnʾ (.....)štδʾrt ❍❍ (cy)w(yʔ)δδ
/12/ (pyδʾr) (p)[ʾrwt]y ʾẓ-γʾrt [prmʾnh]
/13/ Lʾ δβʾrt δ(ʾrʾn)t[6]
/14/ γyrtr ZKh ʾ(β/y)[8]
/15/ (pncmykw) (ʾXY-Wʾ)y pt[3](...)[1–2](.)
/16/ wyšn k(.tr.)y mn(t)[5]
/17/ γrβʾkstr [4](❍) [rt](y) [wʾn](k)w
/18/ w(ʾ/n.δk) (w)[γ](δ)[ʾr](t kt) ZKw ctβʾr
/19/ ʾ(XY)[Wtrt] ZY m(y) pty-xwʾy ZY (kδ)[r]y
/20/ xw wʾ/nxrš[5] (cy/β/f/yʾ/n)[6] (t)[4](s)ʾr
/21/ (p)[2–3](t) ❍❍ rty nwkr (.)[3](p/k.)y
/22/ (ʾstʾβtʾk)w ZY ʾš(kw)[1–2](w/y/r) ʾ[4](..)

[5] It could also be read wnγrš, "salvation."
[6] The first letter is illegible and it is not clear whether this word consists of three or four letters. Could one read here cyn for cnn?

v/hl / * *pnc*[*]
/1/ [ ]
/2/ p(δ)[< l.]
/3/ ʾyw (.)[< l.]
interlinear:
/3a/ pnc[ ]
/4/ k(.ʾn)[< l.]
interlinear:
/4a/ (..)[ ]
/5/ ʾyw (..mš?) [< l.]
/6/ rʾmʾnt(y)[3](y/β)rt[8]
/7/ (ʾ)[5–6](.) ZY š(n) pr xwrm ZY
/8/ (š)[ ] Lʾ pδwβs(n)tw ZY (rymnyt)
/9/ [Lʾ] xnt ❍❍ rty kwprm ẓ-wʾnt(y)
/10/ [4–5] (ZY) mwnw ʾrk kwnʾ (rty)
/11/ [ʾs]kʾt(r) (x)w δyw ʾyδcw ptyrn
/12/ [3–4](..t) rty n(w)[kr]cy-wyδδ
/13/ [6](.) Z(Y) (pr)ʾyš[7] ❍❍ ❍❍
/14/ [8] βwt δyw
/15/ xw(ty) xw [2](.)[1]k(.)r(.) (tnpʾr xcy)
/16/ ʿM p(ʾ)[rʾy](kt)[8] δywty prʾyw ❍❍ ZY
/17/ (pn)[c](ʾXYW-tr)t [Z]Kh pnc
/18/ p(wt)yšt ZY p(ryš)tʾktw xnt
/19/ ky ZY pr ʾβtʾ z-wrnʾk (ZK)h
/20/ rw(ʾn)[th ʾkw] wštmʾxsʾr šk(rt)
/21/ δ(ʾ)[rnt ❍❍] ❍❍ ZY š(m)[n]w pr (p.)[3–4](t)
/22/ p(.)[7–8] ZY (βγ)y-šty

r/hl/ [ ]
/1/ [ ]
/2/ [ ]him
/3/ [ ]did
/4/ [ ]…
/5/ [ ](his)
/6/ [ ]did.

[7] The reading is not clear. Maybe all letters belong to one word and can be read nypʾys, "he wrote" (N. Sims-Williams, personal communication).
[8] Reading and reconstruction by W. Sundermann, personal communication.

/7/ And this time at one day [ ]
/8/ brother did the work not quickly [ ]
/9/ and he killed him immediately.
/10/ Furthermore he did…in this way
/11/ to those three brothers. Therefore
/12/ they did not give[a command]
/13/ quickly.[ ]
/14/ later the…[ ]
/15/ (fifth brother) [ ]
/16/ they/them……[ ]
/17/ most wise [ ]. [An]d [s]o
/18/ …(spoke): "He has killed my four
/19/ brothers, and (now)
/20/ he/the (fight/salvation of) [ ]
/21/ …And now [ ]
/22/ vehement and (diffi)[cult]

v/hl/ *Five* [ ]
/1/ [ ]
/2/ …[ ]
/3/ one [ ]
interlinear:
/3a/ five/fifth[ ]
/4/ …[
/4a/ …[ ]
/5/ one…[ ]
/6/ always[ ]…[ ]
/7/ [ ] and them in dust
/8/ [ ] they do not stick and they are
/9/ [not] dirty. And as long as <he> [has been]
/10/ living and did this work,[9] as much / and more
/11/ the demon [ ] any reason
/12/ [ ]. And [now] of this
/13/ [ ]and (he) sent.
/14/ [ ] the demon is
/15/ self he/the……

[9] Or: "As long as the [Redeemer] of the Living did this work" (W. Sundermann, personal communication).

/16/ together with the (remaining) demons. And
/17/ the (five brothers) are the five
/18/ Buddhas and (apostles),
/19/ who guided the souls into the
/20/ paradise during the seven periodes.
/21/ And Ahriman in…
/22/ [ ] and the gods

The story contained in these fragments tells us something about brothers who are in conflict with a demon. We learn on the recto side that one brother could not do anything fast enough. That is why he was killed. Three brothers remain. The following parts are difficult to understand. Then one brother is speaking: "He has killed my four brothers…" So we may deduce that the story is about five brothers. Maybe the fifth brother strengthened his efforts in the fight against the demon. We do not know what happened.

On the verso side we find the epimythion mentioned above: "And the (five brothers) are the five Buddhas and (apostles), who guided the souls to paradise during the seven periods." So we learn that our presumption of five brothers is correct and that they are the five Buddhas and apostles. In the epimythion the devil is mentioned. I think, therefore, that one can identify the demon of the story with Ahriman. In the Manichaean myth Greed and Ahriman induced several persons to slander the apostles and to spoil the religions, as is mentioned in the Sogdian text So 18248 I, published by W. B. Henning in "The murder of the magi."[10]

Who are the five Buddhas and apostles? I think that the expression "Buddhas and apostles" is used as a hendiadys, referring to the apostles of Light who have brought the redeeming knowledge to humankind and by this means show the way to paradise. Buddhas have been mentioned in this sense in various texts according to the Dictionary by Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst,[11] mainly in some Parthian and Middle Persian hymns.

[10] Henning 1944.
[11] Durkin-Meisternst 2004, 118.

What is surprising is the number of the apostles. Usually we know of four apostles: Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus Christ and Mani.[12] This list of four apostles is given in the quotation of the *Šābuhragān* by al-Bīrūnī,[13] and in the list of apostles mentioned in the hymnic dialogue between Jesus and the child in the fragment M 42.[14] Lists of many transmitters of the divine manifestation are also preserved. In the Central Asiatic sources given by al-Šahrastānī, for example, these are Adam, Seth, Noah, Abraham, the Buddha, Zarathushtra, Christ, Paul and Muhammad.[15] In another list: Šēm, Sēm, Enōš, (Nikotheos,) and Henoch.[16] The list in the Coptic Kephalaia is: Sethel, Enosh, Enoch, Sem, Buddha Aurentēs, Zaradēs, Jesus Christ;[17] this list unfortunately exceeds the desired number five. This subject has been discussed in detail by John C. Reeves, in a chapter on "Manichaeism and the Biblical forefathers" in his book *Heralds of that Good Realm*.[18]

But there are also lists of four prophets preceding Mani: The "Homily addressed to laymen" (nγ'wš'k'n'k wy-δβ'γ) lists Adam, Azrušč (Zarathushtra), Buddha Šākman (Šākyamuni), and Christ.[19] In this text Adam is added to the common three predecessors of Mani. Another proof for the addition of Adam is given by the snatches of the legend of Zarathushtra, partly published by W. Sundermann.[20] These fragments may belong to a detailed description of the lives of the prophets before Mani, of which the so called 'Zarathustralegende' is one part. The other parts are very mutilated and cannot be reconstructed easily. Nevertheless the mention of the Jews and Paul, and the reconstruction of Adam make it a reliable assumption that the text deals with the predecessors of Mani. In M 129/r/15/ Adam receives the religion from Jesus the Splendor.[21] This agrees with a report by Theodore bar

---

[12] *Kephalaia, 1. Hälfte (Lfg 1–10)*, Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin 1, H. J. Polotsky and A. Böhlig, eds. (Stuttgart 1934–40), 7.6–8.7 (Gardner 1995, 13). See Smagina 1992, 356–357.

[13] *Chronology of Ancient Nations* ed. by Sachau 1879, 190 and 207, 14–18.

[14] Andreas/Henning 1934, 879–881.

[15] Haarbrücker 1850, vol. I, 285–291, quoted from Böhlig/Asmussen 1980, 155.

[16] Henning 1934, 27–28.

[17] *Keph* 1, 7.23–8.8 (Gardner 1995, 18). See Smagina 1992, 357.

[18] Reeves 1996, 5–30.

[19] Henning 1944, 136, 138, 140–141. In this text the victims of the slanderers are split between one in the West, Adam, and one in the East, the Brahmanic religion. This is the only passage where the Brahmanic religion is mentioned as one of the predecessors of Mani.

[20] Sundermann 1986, 465 and n. 24 (So 18432/r/8/ unpubl.).

[21] Sundermann 1994, 319–320.

Kōnai.[22] This important story of Adam's enlightenment, repeated in multiple Manichaean sources, explains why Adam can be included in the line of the prophets.

However, the Middle Persian fragments of the *Book of Giants* (M 101a–n and M 911) give Šīt[īl] as first forerunner, followed by (reconstructed) [Zarathushtra,] Buddha, and Christ.[23] Four preceding Buddhas (rendered as "prophets" in Clark's translation) are mentioned also in the Turkish "Great Hymn to Mani," 66: "You descended after the four Prophets. You obtained the unsurpassable blessed state of being a Prophet";[24] Clark argues that Šītīl could be the additional prophet. So it is still undecided whether Adam or Šītīl(Seth) should be added as the first apostle.

Five Buddhas are mentioned also in several other Sogdian and Turkish texts. The liturgical fragment M 114, for example, mentions five Buddhas.[25] Henning has published also two lines of the Sogdian fragment M 6330 (/r/1–2/), where "the five Buddhas of the three periods" are mentioned.[26] My colleague Jens Wilkens has informed me that there are five Buddhas in the Turkish fragment U 64a+b+Mainz 435b. Here the Light-Nous is praised: "Mein Gott, der du, nachdem du die Weisheit der fünf Buddhas herabkommen ließest, in der Mitte der Ebene von Bizäkün erschienen bist…"[27]

Zs. Gulácsi has described three pictures as representations of the prophets preceding Mani: MIK III 4947 + MIK III 5d,[28] MIK III 4970c,[29] and the lost fragment originally published by Le Coq on page 8 of his *Chotscho*.[30] Le Coq himself already expressed his supposition that these are representations of Mani and his predecessors.[31] Referring to the fragment MIK III 4947 + MIK III 5d, one could imagine that Mani is the central person in the middle of the painting, while his predecessors are sitting around him. We can conclude this from the title *pwt* "Buddha" written on the chest of the person in the right corner.

---

[22] Theodore bar Kōnai: *Liber scholiorum*, CSCO 69, A. Scher, ed., 317, quoted from Böhlig/Asmussen 1980, 107–108.
[23] Henning 1943, 57 lines 153–155, and 63.
[24] Clark 1982, 183 with note on 196–197.
[25] Henning 1937, 47.
[26] Henning 1936, 585 on zwrnyy.
[27] Wilkens 1999/2000, 222–223.
[28] Gulácsi 2001, nr. 66, 46–148.
[29] Gulácsi 2001, nr. 50.2, 117–118.
[30] Repr. Gulácsi 2001, 266.
[31] Le Coq 1923, 45.

In a Buddhist painting Buddha never would be a marginal figure. The reading is disputed, but I prefer the reading *pwt*. The lost picture possibly showed the same situation. Here the Nestorian cross lets us assume that Jesus was depicted. It is possible that these representations were formed like Buddhist Pranidhi-scenes. But of course we must be aware that these are all speculations because of the fragmentary character of the evidence.

Now that we have an idea of the five prophets, what are the seven periods? In the text M 6330, quoted above, three periods are mentioned. The Manichaean religion itself is called sometimes "Religion of the two principles and the three periods."[32] These three periods are: (1) the existence of the Light and Dark Realm side by side, (2) the period of mixture, creation of the cosmos, and redeeming of the light, and (3) the separation of Light and Dark and the eternal peace.[33] The three periods are also mentioned in the *Kephalaia*, called the beginning, the middle and the end.[34] But these latter three periods are in fact divisions of the Middle period of mixture. Nevertheless, one cannot conclude that a clear regional difference existed on this subject between Eastern and Western Manichaean traditions. G. Wurst has shown that the three times of the Eastern tradition are reflected in the Coptic Bemapsalm 223.[35]

A very common formula for the occasional appearance of the apostles in Manichaean Sogdian texts is zwrnyy zwrnyy, "from time to time" (equivalent to the Middle Persian formula pd ʾwʾm ʾwʾm),[36] for example in the as yet unpublished text, So 10200(5)/v/. This fragment and So 20192 once belonged to the same page. Here I quote only the pertinent passage:

So 10200(5)/v/
/6/ [ctβ](ʾ)rmykw[37] (nwy)[myδ x](w)ty myδ ʾʾγty
/7/ [3](...)[2]ptγʾmβrt ZY βγʾy ʾẓ-ʾnt

[32] For example in the *Xwāstwānīft* § VIII, Asmussen 1965, 196.
[33] See "The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, The Buddha of Light," 81a1–10 (Schmidt-Glintzer 1987), 75.
[34] *Keph* 17, 55.16–57.32 (Gardner 1995, 59–61), cf. Nagel 1974, 204–207.
[35] Wurst 1994, 170–172.
[36] M 299a/1/ Henning, 1934, 27.
[37] The small piece at the beginning of the line should be turned over, because the punctuation mark belongs to the end of the line of the recto side.

/8/ [1–2](t) ° (k)y z-wrny z-wrny ẓ-mnyʾ ẓ-mnyʾ[38]
/9/ (pr) βʾcmpδ ʾwxwz-ʾntw[39] wynʾncykw wβʾntw
/10/ [1](.kw) (. ʾpyky) mrtxmyncw δʾmy ršty rʾδ
/11/ [1–2](…)[1–2](pδ) ʾštʾy(ʾ)[nt ZY ʾkw](w)[š]tmʾxw sʾr
/12/ [ʾškʾr](ʾ)[ntw] °

/6/ Fourth: The new day itself is the Tathāgata,
/7/ [ ] the envoys and god's messengers
/8/ [ ], who from period to period, time to time,
/9/ descend to the world and become visible
/10/ (… …) show the human beings the right way
/11/ [from the world] and [lead] them to paradise.

This passage refers to the apostles, called here ptγʾmβrt ZY βγʾy ʾẓ-γʾnt, "envoys and god's messengers," who are sent by the Light-Nous to enlighten and to redeem humankind. A similar formula is given in the text So 14187 + So 14190.[40] In this text a lady asks Mani for forgiveness and confesses her faith with the words:

/2/ [1](n/ʾ)k β/y/w)[7](..k)[zwrn]y z-w(r)[ny]
/3/ cykt pwttyšty pšʾ[γ](r)y[w](ʾ)k ZY pr[w]
/4/ βrʾyštʾk

"[I was waiting] for the paraclete of the Buddhas of the different periods and for the apostle." This formula zwrny zwrnycykt pwtyšt is also used in letters, e.g. L 44, line 8.[41]

So far, however, I have not found any evidence for a seven-period scheme in Manichaean texts. For this reason, we must look for such a concept in the materials of other religions with which Manichaeism had contact. One Zoroastrian apocalypse, the *Zand ī Wahman Yasn*, speaks about a tree which had seven branches, one of gold, one of silver, one of copper, one of brass, one of lead, one of steel and one on <which>

[38] There are two diacritical dots under the z of z-mnyʾ in both cases.
[39] Unusual writing for ʾwxz-. In this text the scribe several times wrote a superfluous -w.
[40] Reck 2007, 60–61, ll. 50–52.
[41] Sims-Williams 1981, 235–236.

iron had been mixed, which Zarduxšt saw in his dream.[42] Could it be possible that these ideas influenced the interpretation of our story? Otherwise, the Buddhist tradition knows a succession of seven Buddhas: Vipashyin, Shikin, Vishvabhū, Krakuchchanda, Konagāmana, Kāshyapa and Šākyamuni.[43] The adherents of the Maitreya-schools await the future Buddha Maitreya. Do the seven periods reflect the eras of the former seven Buddhas?

In Buddhism five Buddhas are known in the Buddhakula, the Buddha-family, shown in the Mandala of the five Tathāgatas: Vairochana, Akshobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha, and Amoghasiddhi.[44] Could it be that these ideas influenced the Manichaean interpretation of the story of the five brothers? We do not know. But the figures five and seven are very often used in the Manichaean literature itself. We know of many examples. Added, they yield 12, the next symbolic figure in Manichaeism.[45] One can assume that the figures five and seven in this story are topoi for a better understanding of the Manichaean myth. We find the same usage of the figures five and seven in the epimythion of the parable of Bašndād in MIK III 8259, published by W. Sundermann.[46] There seven *ratnas* (jewels) and five *mahābhūtas* (great elements) are mentioned. The *Sermon of the Soul* contains five *ratnas* and five *mahābhūtas* as part of many other identifications of the five divine light elements.[47] The similes given there end with the "fünf brüderliche Wundenträger, aus denen der fünffältige Wald wächst." W. Sundermann identifies the forest with the Manichaean church, i.e., the five ranks of the Manichaean hierarchy. But he admits that the allegory of the five wounded brothers is unusual. Could it be an allusion to our five brothers, the prophets of the true religion?

What about literary antecedents of tales about brothers? Tales and mythological legends commonly involve three brothers. The two older ones fail; but the youngest brother, often under-estimated, is victorious.[48]

---

[42] Cereti 1995, 151–152. The first chapter mentions only four branches of the tree, "of gold, silver, steel, and 'mixed' iron, symbolizing four periods to come after the millennium of Zarathustra." See Sundermann 1989, 492a.

[43] Troje 1925, 94–95 n. 2, and *Lexikon der östlichen Weisheitslehren*, 51–54.

[44] Additional other lists of five Buddhas are known, see Lokesh Chandra, *Dictionary of Buddhist Iconography*, Bd. 4, 1128.

[45] Tables of pentads and dodecads are listed in Sundermann 1992, 137–141.

[46] Sundermann 1973, 98–99, text 33; facsimile: Gulácsi 2001, 58–60, transl. 221–224, nr. 28.

[47] Sundermann 1997, 86–87, with explanation on 141–142, § 119.

[48] Lüthi 1979, col. 846.

A special form is that of the quick, dexterous or skillful brothers.[49] The fact that one brother in our text could not do something fast enough leads us to assume that the abilities of the brothers also play an important role.

There is a Buddhist story, the "Puṇyavanta-Jātaka,"[50] in which five princes have different merits or capabilities. The fifth brother, the most virtuous one, becomes the king after his father's death and the Buddha identifies himself with this brother, because he esteems virtuousness most. This story is transmitted in the *Kalila wa Dimna* as the story of the four friends. Its Indian origin was proved by J. Hertel.[51] The Buddhist redaction enlarged the number of the four friends into five and changed the friends into brothers. Presumably this is not the same story as our parable. Unfortunately, we do not know enough of the parable of the five brothers in our Manichaean text to be able to compare it directly to these parallels. But it is an example of the victory of the fifth brother, whereas in many tales mostly only three brothers are in competition. We know, for example, the Manichaean story of the three princes in Old Turkic.[52] Unfortunately, its epimythion is not preserved. But the editors guess that the three princes and brothers could be identified with the three main envoys of the Manichaean myth: the Primal Man, the Living Spirit, and the Third messenger.

However, the motif of brothers in contest or in struggle is familiar also in Manichaean lore. Yukiyo Kasai has recently published an article on "Ein Kolophon um die Legende von Bokug Kagan".[53] The legend is transmitted in Persian, Chinese, and Uygur. The texts differ in some points. I summarize briefly: There was a tree or two trees in Mongolia between two rivers. It / They got pregnant by the heavenly light. Then five children were born. The fifth was called Bokug. After he was grown up he became the ruler of Mongolia because he was the best or because of the death of the other children. In a night he dreamed that an old man in white clothes met him and gave him an oracle. Bokug became the king of the Uygurs. After his death the Uygurs lost the Mongol territory and went to the Tianshan area. According to Y. Kasai the tree, the heavenly light, and the white clothes show the

[49] Ranke 1979, col. 868.
[50] Sieg 1944, 18–20, and Dschi Hiän-lin 1943, 284–303.
[51] Hertel 1914, 371–385.
[52] Geng Shimin/Klimkeit/Laut 1989, 329–345.
[53] Kasai 2004, 9 and n. 22.

Manichaean influence in this legend. I think that the figure five is also Manichaean. The fact that the fifth became the ruler is similar to the victory of the fifth brother in our tale.

Looking for parallels in the Manichaean Middle Iranian literature, I have found the small fragment M 6470, published by Werner Sundermann.[54] This fragment contains text in several languages: The headline and the last word of a Middle Persian text in the first line, a Sogdian sentence, and a Parthian story. Here I provide the text in English translation:

The Middle Persian headline:
"[The parable]s of the (two??) brothers sho[ws]"
The last word of a Middle Persian text:
"…increased."
Sogdian:
"To the (gods?) shall be [ ]."
The Parthian Parable:
"The parable (of) the evil demon: It is told, that there was an (evil) and thievish demon. And always he (damaged) [ ] and in a house [ ] <verso> he is not able to do. The [ ] did it in one moment. One day the swift [ ] was not able to give a command to the older brother. Immediately the [ ] got up and killed him. And [ ] to [ ] to the fifth."

What do both fragmentary texts have in common? A demon, brothers, that something is to be done swiftly enough, that the demon kills one brother, a fifth is mentioned, but we can not be sure whether the fifth brother is meant. The differences are that the title of the story given at the beginning in red is "The parable of the evil demon." On the top of the page is given: "The parables of the [ ] brothers show." W. Sundermann assumed in his edition that a b should fill the gap. He further assumed that the letter b is being used to represent the number 2. This would be a unique use in Manichaean texts. On the basis of the remaining parts of the letters, I would suggest reading pnj. So we could read this headline: "The parables of the five brothers show." Another possible way to translate this sentence could be "It shows: The parables

[54] Sundermann 1973, 93–94, text 28; facsimile: Pls. 43 and 44.

of the five brothers."[55] The question remains why the word parable is in plural. Are there more parables of the five brothers? Is the parable with the evil demon only one of them? We do not know.

Nevertheless both parables contain the element that one brother is not fast enough, and he is killed by the demon. That is why this fragmentary parable could be the same story as the Sogdian one under consideration.

In his paper at the fifth Conference on Manichaean Studies, Werner Sundermann presented the *Ārdhang wifrās* to us and identified the *Ārdhang* with the *Pragmateia*.[56] Some of the fragments list résumés of parables. Sundermann pointed out that one of these, M 258, mentions the parable "About the demon who killed four brothers, and the youngest brother killed the demon" (see n. 16: "M 258/I/V/1–3/ ʾ[c] (dy)w (ky)[ʾw] (cfr) br(ʾdr)ʾ(n)[ʾwjd] (ʾwd qsʾdr br ʾd ʾw dyw ʾwjd)."). One can assume that this is the story of which remains are preserved in Parthian and in Sogdian. P. O. Skjærvø also presumes that the *Pragmateia* could have contained the legends about the Prophets and their times, and for this reason he came to the same conclusion as W. Sundermann.[57]

The question is whether this story of the five brothers fighting against the demon is the same as that mentioned in the *Ārdhang wifrās*. If the *Ārdhang* is to be identified with the *Pragmateia* and the *Ārdhang wifrās* is referring to this work, did Mani himself then identify the line of five prophets? If so, why did he not give the same line in the *Šābuhragān*?

Jorinde Ebert has drawn my attention to a very fragmentary painting on silk which is housed in the Museum of Indian Art in Berlin under the number MIK III 6279 a–h.[58] It contains a very fragmentary text in Parthian and Middle Persian in Manichaean script of unfortunately unidentified content.[59] Therefore an identification of the illustration is not attempted. We could imagine that it shows the brothers fighting against the demon. But caution is called for, since we have no definite indication for this, besides the existence of a demon and at least two fighters.

To sum up: There are two parables about five brothers, one in Parthian, one in Sogdian. A demon kills one brother after the other. The

---

[55] Suggested by W. Sundermann.
[56] Sundermann 2005, 381–382.
[57] Skjaervo 1996, 624.
[58] Gulácsi 2001, 171, fig. 77.
[59] Edited by J. BeDuhn in Gulácsi 2001, 243.

youngest brother overcomes the demon. The epimythion of the Sogdian story explains that the brothers are the five Buddhas and apostles, who guide the souls to paradise during the seven periods. We assume that the light apostles are meant and do not know who was the first apostle in this parable, because there are usually only four apostles mentioned in Manichaean literature. It could be Adam or Seth for example. We do not know which seven periods are meant. We can assume that Zoroastrian or Buddhist traditions could have provided this scheme. But the most probable explanation is that the figures five and seven are used as topoi. The quotation of this story in the *Ārdhang wifrās*, if it refers to the *Pragmateia*, one of the canonical scripts by Mani himself, would allow us to conclude that he himself introduced the idea of a line of five prophets. We do not know whether he expressly had the Buddhist story of the five brothers in mind, or whether other ideas supplied him with this conception of his place in the history of religion.

Bibliography

Andreas, F. C. and W. B. Henning
1934 Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan III, *SbPAW*, PH, 1934, 846–912.

Asmussen, J. P.
1965 *Xᵘāstwānīft. Studies in Manichaeism*, Acta Theologica Danica 7 (Copenhagen).

Böhlig, A. and J. P. Asmussen
1980 *Die Gnosis*. III. *Der Manichäismus* (Zürich-München).

Cereti, C.
1995 *The Zand ī Wahman Yasn: A Zoroastrian Apocalypse*, Serie Orientale Roma 75 (Roma).

Clark, L.
1982 The Manichean Turkic Pothi-Book, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 9: 145–218.

Colditz, I.
1987 Bruchstücke manichäisch-parthischer Parabelsammlungen, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 14.2: 274–313.

Dschi Hiän-lin
1943 Parallelversionen zur tocharischen Rezension des Punyavanta-Jātaka, *ZDMG* 97=N.F. 22: 284–324.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D.
2004 *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum: Subsidia; Dictionary of Manichaean Texts, Vol. III, Part 1 (Turnhout).

Gardner, I.
1995 *The Kephalaia of the Teacher: the edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in translation with commentary*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 37 (Leiden).

Geng Shimin, H.-J. Klimkeit, and J. P. Laut
1989 Die Geschichte der drei Prinzen: Weitere manichäische Fragmente aus Turfan, *ZDMG* 139: 329–345.

Gulácsi, Zs.
2001 *Manichaean Art in Berlin Collections: A comprehensive catalogue of Manichean artifacts belonging to the Berlin State Museums of the Prussian Cultural Foundation, Museum of Indian Art, and the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences, desposited in the Berlin State Library of the Prussian Cultural Foundation*, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum: Series Archaeologica et Iconographica 1 (Turnhout).

Haarbrücker, T.
1850 *Religionspartheien und Philosophenschulen (Schahrastani's Kitab al -milal wa'l-nihal)* (Halle).

Henning, W. B.
1934 Ein manichäisches Henochbuch, *SbPAW.* 1934, 27–35.
1936 Sogdische Miszellen, *BSOS* 8: 583–588.
1937 *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*, APAW 1936, Nr. 10 (Berlin).
1943 The Book of the Giants, *BSOAS* 11.1: 52–74.
1944 The murder of the Magi, *JRAS* 1944:133–144.
1945 Sogdian Tales, *BSOAS* 11.3: 465–487.

Hertel, J.
1914 *Das Pañjatantra: seine Geschichte und seine Verbreitung* (Leipzig/Berlin).

Kasai, Y.
2004 Ein Kolophon um die Legende von Bokug Kagan, *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 19: 1–25.

Le Coq, A. v.
1923 *Die buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien, II: Die manichäischen Miniaturen* (Berlin).

Lüthi, M.
1979 Bruder, Brüder, *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, K. Ranke et al., eds. (Berlin), col. 844–861.
Nagel, P.
1974 Bemerkungen zum manichäischen Zeit- und Geschichtsverständnis, *Studia Coptica*, Berliner byzantinische Arbeiten 45, P. Nagel, ed. (Berlin), 201–214.
Ranke, K.
1979 Brüder, die behenden B., *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, K. Ranke et al., eds. (Berlin), col. 868–871.
Reck, Ch.
2007 Die Bekehrung einer Christin zum manichäischen Glauben? Probleme bei der Interpretation eines fragmentarischen Textes, *Inkulturation des Christentums im Sasanidenreich*, A. Mustafa and J. Tubach with S. W. Vashalomidze, eds. (Wiesbaden), 55–70.
Reeves, J. C.
1996 *Heralds of That Good Realm: Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 41 (Leiden).
Sachau, E.
1879 *The Chronology of Ancient Nations* (London).
Schmidt-Glintzer, H.
1987 *Chinesische Manichaica. Mit textkritischen Anmerkungen und einem Glossar*, Studies in Oriental Religions 14 (Wiesbaden).
Sieg, E.
1943 Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen, *APAW* 1943, Nr. 16, (Berlin), 18–20.
Sims-Williams, N.
1981 The Sogdian fragments of Leningrad, *BSOAS* 44.2: 231–240.
Skjærvø, P. O.
1996 Zarathustra in the Avesta and in Manicheism. Irano-Manichaica IV, with a contribution by Peter Zieme, *La Persia e l'Asia Centrale da Alessandro al X secolo: convegno internazionale, roma, 9–12 novembre 1994, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. In Collaborazione con l'Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente*, Atti dei Convegni Lincei 127 (Roma), 597–628.
Smagina, E. B.
1992 Die Reihe der manichäischen Apostel in den koptischen Texten, *Studia Manichaica: II. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, 6.–10. August 1989, St. Augustin/Bonn*, Studies in Oriental Religions 23, H.-J. Klimkeit, ed. (Wiesbaden), 356–366.
Sundermann, W.
1973 *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer mit einigen Bemerkungen zu Motiven der Parabeltexte von Friedmar Geissler*, Berliner Turfantexte 4 (Berlin).
1985 *Ein manichäisch-soghdisches Parabelbuch*, Berliner Turfantexte 15 (Berlin).
1986 Bruchstücke einer manichäischen Zarathustralegende, *Studia Grammatica Iranica. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*, Münchner Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, n.F., Beiheft 13, R. Schmitt and P. O. Skjærvø, eds. (München), 461–482.
1989 Bahman Yašt, *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. 3, pp. 492a–493b.
1992 *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous. Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version*, Berliner Turfantexte 17 (Berlin).
1994 Eva illuminatrix, *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65. Geburtstag*, H. Preissler and H. Seiwert, eds. (Marburg), 317–327.
1997 *Der Sermon von der Seele: Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version mit einem Anhang von Peter Zieme: Die türkischen Fragmente des "Sermons von der Seele"*, Berliner Turfantexte 19 (Turnhout).

2005 Was the *Ārdhang* Mani's Picture-Book? *Il Manicheismo. Nuove prospettive della ricerca. Atti del quinto congresso internazionale di studi sul manicheismo, dipartimento di Studi Asiatici, Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale", Napoli, 2–8 Settembre 2001*, Manichaean Studies 5, Aloïs van Tongerloo and Luigi Cirillo, eds. (Turnhout), 373–384.

Troje, L.
1925 *Die Dreizehn und die Zwölf im Traktat Pelliot (Dogmen in Zahlenformeln): Ein Beitrag zu den Grundlagen des Manichäismus* (Leizpig).

Wilkens, J.
1999/2000 Ein manichäisch-türkischer Hymnus auf den Licht-Nous, *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, N.F. 16: 217–231.
2003 Indiens Beitrag zur Erzählungsliteratur der zentralasiatischen Manichäer, *Indien und Zentralasien: Sprach- und Kulturkontakt. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposions vom 7. Bis 10. Mai 2001*, Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 61, S. Bretfeld und J. Wilkens, eds. (Wiesbaden), 239–258.

Wurst, G.
1994 Zur Bedeutung der "Drei-Zeiten"-Formel in den koptisch-manichäischen Texten von Medinet Madi, *Peregrina Curiositas: Eine Reise durch den orbis antiquus. Zu Ehren von Dirk Van Damme*, Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 27, A. Kessler, ed. (Göttingen), 167–179.

A MANICHAEAN COLLECTION OF LETTERS AND A LIST OF MANI'S LETTERS IN MIDDLE PERSIAN

Werner Sundermann
Berlin

Mani, the "Apostle of Jesus Christ," not only copied St. Paul's self-presentation in the incipit of his letters; he by far outdid him as a prolific writer of instructive and hortative epistles to individuals and communities of his church. His disciples followed the master's pattern. They are mentioned as fellow-authors of some of Mani's letters,[1] or they composed their own epistles.[2] Furthermore there were certainly parishes who did not hesitate to turn to Mani when they felt they were in need of an authorized decision on problems.[3] So there must have existed a voluminous and multifarious epistolary Manichaean literature from the beginning of Manichaeism.

Thanks to a precious tradition preserved in the Dublin *Kephalaia* we know that Mani employed a clerical office. He dictated (as St. Paul did) letters to his staff meant to be sent to more than one addressee (and to be archived).[4] It is small wonder that Mani's disciples and certainly the master himself[5] began to collect and archive this wealth of epistolary production, and that the collection of Mani's letters was subsequently regarded as one of Mani's canonical works, a canonized collection, it is true, which gained less reputation than his *Gospel*, his *Treasure of Life*, etc., since, according to the 148th *Kephalaion*, the epistles were not revealed by a deity but composed by Mani himself.[6]

Epistolary collections have been known for a long time. An-Nadīm gave in his *Fihrist al-ʿulūm* a list of letters by Mani and, as he put it, *wa l-aʾimati baʿdahū* (and the Imāms after him).[7] But an-Nadim does not clearly specify which of the listed letters were composed by people

[1] Schmidt 1933, 23 (Koustaios); Henning 1937, 18 = 1977, I, 432 (Mār Ammō).
[2] Andreas, Henning 1934, pp. 857–860 = 1977 I, pp. 284–287 (Sisinnios?).
[3] Cf. in the text to be published here frg. 1, /V/12–16.
[4] Quoted after Funk 1997, 158 (chapter 333).
[5] Schmidt 1933, 26.
[6] *Kephalaia I, zweite Hälfte*, ed. Funk 1999, 355. Cf. Henning 1952, 208–209.
[7] Flügel 1862, 73–76, 103–105; Dodge 1970, 799–800.

other than Mani. Among the Coptic Manichaean texts of Medinet Madi there was also a corpus of letters by Mani and his disciples.[8] It was taken to Berlin, only to disappear for the most part in the chaotic events of 1945 and 1946 before it could be edited and published.[9] What has been left is, for the time being, a couple of folios, and a reliable description of the manuscript by Carl Schmidt already in 1933.[10] It is good news, however, that the editorial work on those parts which are presently accessible has been recently taken up by W.-P. Funk and I. Gardner, the first results of whose work already has been published.[11]

Single letters or excerpts of Mani's letters, intended to be read in the liturgical service, have turned up among the Iranian Manichaean Turfan texts;[12] but many more letter fragments in Sogdian language are products of the Central Asian community and thus of a later date,[13] as are also most of the recently found Coptic Manichaean letters of the Kellis oasis.[14] Those among the letters from Kellis, however, that certainly or most likely belong to the corpus of Mani's canonical epistles will be published by I. Gardner in collaboration with W.-P. Funk.[15] In addition, some letters of Mani are quoted by Christian polemicists, such as the *Epistula Fundamenti*, cited so often by Augustine that it has been possible to reconstruct long passages of its text,[16] or Mani's letter to Menoch quoted by Julian of Eclanum against Augustine, but of doubtful authenticity.[17]

These testimonies suffice to prove the presence of Mani's letters wherever Manichaeism took root, and to prove the existence of epistolary collections of his letters in Mesopotamia and Egypt. It is by no means sure that such collections were faithful renderings of Mani's original corpus of letters as a canonical book of his church. Of an-Nadīm's Arabic list of 76 letters one can say that it represents a rather incomplete collection of what the second or third generation had of the epistolary material of the first generation. Such a re-edition may have

---

[8] Schmidt 1933, 23–26.
[9] Robinson 1992, 55–57.
[10] Cf. n. 8.
[11] Gardner 2001, 97–104.
[12] Boyce 1960, 147.
[13] Cf. the provisional remarks in Boyce 1968, 73.
[14] Gardner 1997, 84–94; Gardner, Alcock, Funk 1999; Gardner, Lieu 2004, 272–281.
[15] Gardner 2001, 95–97.
[16] Feldmann 1987; Stein 2002.
[17] Stein 1998, cf. esp. 36–37, 39.

been made easier because of the relatively low grade of canonicity of Mani's letters.

It was to be expected that epistolary collections existed also in the Eastern Manichaean tradition. It can now be proved in the case of Manichaean literature in Middle Persian language, thanks to a number of small fragments the writing style of which, more cursive than formal, proves that they belong to one and the same manuscript. They are the following fragments: M 501p, M 882c, M 1402, M 5770, M 5771, M 5772, M 6604, M 6935, M 6944, and M 9152. Taken by themselves they hardly make sense. And yet, Mary Boyce was able to communicate Henning's discovery that M 882c was a part of a "letter of Mani."[18]

This is true, and it becomes even more obvious once one joins most of the small pieces to fragments of two codex sheets. Two groups emerge: (1) M 5770 + M 5771 + M 5772 + M 6604 and (2) M 501p + M 882c + M 1402 + M 9152. Two fragments, M 6935 and M 6944, seem to remain isolated.

I have known this for quite a while now. But only now that I have taken the time to scrutinize these pieces more carefully have I discovered that they are not the remains of one letter, but of at least two letters, both probably by Mani, and of the introduction to yet another letter, addressed to Mani and written by representatives of the Manichaean church. The letters were assembled in a book of codex format. That much seems to be certain. But the sequence of the texts on the two sides of the two sheets of paper remains doubtful. The assumed sequence of Recto and Verso of both sheets follows the supposed and partly restored line of thought. The side margins offer no criteria. Fragment 1 has none, fragment 2 does, but unfortunately both of equal breadth. My arrangement of sheet 1 and 2 is tentative and based only on the possibility that letter 2 of fragment 2 is an answer to question(s) put in fragment 1, lines 12–16 Verso(?). The texts as I understand them are presented in facsimile in the plates, and in transliteration and translation in an appendix. Letter 1 begins on fragment 1, line 1 Recto, and ends in line 12 Verso before the punctuation marks. Following those marks and up to the end of fragment 1 (/V/16/), the announcement of a letter is given. Letter 2 covers the whole of fragment 2. The more comprehensible letter 2 was evidently sent to a group of addressees.

[18] Boyce 1960, 60. M 6604 is identified, however, as belonging to a "hymn to the hierarchy" (123).

That distinguishes it from letter 1, the addressee of which is a single person.

The receivers of the *second letter* are called *ʾšmʾẖ dwšystʾn*, "you (Pl.), the most beloved" (/R/3, 5/), or just *ʾšmʾẖ*, "you (Pl.)" (/V/3/), and once *brʾdrʾn dwšystʾn*, "most beloved brethren" (/V/5/). Who might those "most beloved brethren" be? No obvious proper name or place name is to be found. But there is a faint possibility that the letters] *(wr)šʾn* in /R/5/ are the end of a country's name or even the whole of it. *wršʾn* is very much like the spelling *wyršn* of the name "Georgia" in the Parthian version of the inscription of Shapur I at the Kaʿba-i Zardušt which should render a Parthian form *Wiržān*.[19] If we can assume that the author of the Middle Persian letter used the Parthian form of the country's name in the contemporary Parthian Pahlavi spelling, then a letter to Georgia might be proposed in which the writer expresses his wish that the whole Manichaean community of the country, from brothers and sisters in the spirit to servants and slaves, should fare well. The appearance of a Parthian local name in a Middle Persian text might cause surprise. But it would not be exceptional. The opposite took place in the Parthian version of the Manichaean missionary history where the proper Middle Persian form *wrwcʾn* is used.[20]

The author of the letter makes it clear that he has not yet met the community there but that he desires to visit and see them, as he puts it, with his "corporeal eyes" (/V/7/). The words he uses are *cšm ʿy nsʾẖyn*. It is remarkable that *nasāhēn*, lit. "of the dead body, from the corpse," is here used without any negative connotation at all. It is another example of what J. P. Asmussen called the "de-demonisation" of Zoroastrian terms when he commented on the change of meaning of the Avestan word *būšiiąstā*, "demon of sleepiness," to Middle and New Persian (and esp. Jewish Persian) *būšāsb, būšyās*, etc., "sleep" and "dream."[21]

Was there, then, a letter to Georgia? It is not attested in any of the collections or lists of letters. But that does not mean that there was none. In any case, if my understanding of Manichaean missionary history is correct, Mani himself went to Georgia and won over its king Habzā for the Manichaean faith.[22] Henning, it is true, localized the country

[19] Gignoux 1972, 67.
[20] Sundermann 1986, 281–283 = 2001, 317–319.
[21] Asmussen 1982, 112–121.
[22] Sundermann 1974, 131–132; *idem* 1981, 24–25.

in question, there written *wrwc'n*, in the area of modern Afghanistan,[23] but allowed later for the possibility that the name meant Georgia.[24]

If that were so, it would seemingly go against my assumption that Mani was the author of the letter. If he had already been to Georgia, how could he say that he did not know the members of its community? On the other hand, the conversion of the Waručān-šāh might have been the first and last thing Mani achieved in Georgia. The Manichaean community might have grown under the protection of the Waručān-šāh after Mani's departure.

It is much more difficult to give an opinion on the *first letter* (fragment 1, /R/1/ – /V/12/). It can safely be stated, however, that the addressee is one person only. The writer just calls him (or her) "you" (Sg., *twyc*, "you also," /R/5/, cf. *'bryyt*, "upon you," /V/10/). The sender formulates his injunctions as Singular Imperative forms (*twxš*, "strive!" /R/7/, *wynyyr*, "arrange (it)!" /R/14/).

An interesting detail which can be gathered from the defective text of this letter is that it was a second message to one and the same person. This follows from /R/7–9/ where the fragmentary phrases are recognizable "strive that that epistle…," "and also this second one which I now [send]," "to be read and to be placed on it" (i.e. the second letter should be put on top of the first one). The list of Manichaean letters offers more than one example of two or more of Mani's letters addressed to one person. An-Nadīm precisely mentions "The First Epistle to Maynaq the Persian (fem.!)"[25] and "The Second Epistle to Maynaq," and also "The Epistle of (i.e. to) Ardašīr and Maynaq."[26] Already Flügel[27] and Alfaric[28] noticed that this Maynaq must be the virgin Menoch. A letter of Mani's to Menoch was quoted at length by Augustine, but, as was stated already, its authenticity is doubtful. Anyway, it would be rash to conclude that the Middle Persian text stems from Mani's second letter

---

[23] Henning 1945, 87–89 = 1977, II, 227–229.
[24] Henning 1947, 49, n. 1 = 1977, II, 283; *idem* 1952, 206, n. 9.
[25] Arab. *Risāla Maynaq al-fārisīya al-ūlā*, which could also be translated as "The First Persian Epistle to Maynaq" (so Gardner and Lieu), but hardly as "the first epistle to Maynaq, Al-Fārisīyah" (Dodge). My translation follows Flügel, presupposing the identity of Arab. Maynaq and Lat. Menoch.
[26] Flügel 1862, 75, ll. 11–13, cf.104; Dodge 1970, 801; Gardner, Lieu 2004, 166.
[27] Flügel 1862, 379–380.
[28] Alfaric 1919, 70, 74.

to Maynaq or Menoch, and it is not surprising that nothing identical with the Latin text of the letter to Menoch can be found.[29]

Finally, the last lines of the first fragment, /V/12–16/, need some comment. A question is put by high-ranking representatives of the Manichaean hierarchy and by some "brethren," and it is sent to what I restore as *[p](dy)štn ywjdhr*, "the holy place" (/V/16/), which certainly refers to Mani's residence or even Mani himself.

The end of the last line is filled with punctuation marks. So a new text must have followed. It was either the letter of the community to Mani or, if this text was skipped, Mani's answer(s) to the question(s) put to him. Mani's reaction to the community's letter must have been a message to a group of recipients like the second letter of this manuscript. It is tempting to assume that the second letter itself is this answer of Mani. But unfortunately it cannot be proved.

The merit of the two small fragments 3 and 4 is twofold: they confirm the epistolary character of the whole manuscript, and they attest the irregular intrusion of the Parthian word form *'rw'n'n* instead of *rw'n'n*. Whatever the explanation for this phenomenon is, it might lend support to my suggestion to interpret the letters]*wrš'n* in the second fragment as "Georgia," as another intrusion of a Parthian form into the language of the letter.

The text fragments which I present here are but a few only of at least 49 text fragments of letters in Manichaean script and of possibly 28 letter fragments in Sogdian script which came down to us from Turfan and are now housed in the Berlin Academy. Most of them are parts of letters written in or sent to addressees in Central Asia without any claim to a canonical status like those letters which I published in 1984[30] and which Yoshida published in 2000.[31] Their historical value, however, may be great.

The notable exception is fragment So 15502 (T III D 271k). It lists a number of (doubtlessly Mani's) canonical letters and accuses a group of heretics of disfiguring the word of those authoritative works. The fragment has recently been read again by Christiane Reck who has described it in her catalogue of Manichaean texts in Sogdian script.[32]

---

[29] Gardner, Lieu 2004, 172–174.

[30] Sundermann 1984, 289–316, re-edited in the Emmerick Memorial Volume (Sundermann 2007, 403–421).

[31] Yoshida 2000, 3–199.

[32] Reck 2006, 172.

She successfully identified the names of two letters which I had not understood when I came across the text years ago. The relevant passage can be read and translated as follows:

/V/10/ ZY ZKwy npʾky frmʾnh ptwy-rtʾnt
11/ ʾwnʾkw cw ZY ZKwy-h xrδyʾn(?)[33] βrwrtʾ(k)[w]
12/ (Z)Y tʾδy-(s)[tʾny[34]](β)rwrty (oo m)[ry](sy-s)[y-n]
13/ βrwrtʾkw sy-sy-n tw p(ykʾ)[ry βrwrtʾkw]
14/ ʾʾβʾ pry βrwrtʾy[ ]
15/ [pʾ](p)yl prwrtʾkw[ ]

/V/10/ And in the Scriptur(es) they turn away[35] the command
11/ such as in the *Letter to the Khaldeans*(?),[36]
12/ and the *Letter (on) the Judgment*,[37] the *Mār Sīsin* –
13/ *Letter*(?), [the *Letter*] *(to) Sīsin (on) the Two Im[ages]*,
14/ the *Letter (to) Abā (on) Love* [ ]
15/ the *Letter (to) [Ba]bel* [ ]

The titles of seven of certainly many more letters are preserved in this fragment. Some but not all of them have an equivalent in an-Nadīm's list of letter titles. One is the *Letter (on) the Judgment* if that is the *risāla qaḍā al-ʿadl* "Letter on the execution of justice."[38] The [*Letter*] *(to) Sīsin (on) the Two Im[ages]* corresponds to Arabic *risāla sīs d̲āt al-waǧhaini*.[39] It was translated by Flügel as "das doppelsinnige Sendschreiben des Sîs," noting, however, that the literal translation would be "mit zwei Gesichtern."[40] Dodge rendered it loosely as "the double epistle to *Sīs*,"[41] and no closer to the text is M. Laffan's translation, quoted by Gardner

[33] Instead of *r* an *l* is possible. *y* doubtful and only possible if of very small size.
[34] Reading and translation Yoshida (at Sundermann 1986, 61, n. 64 = 2001, 238). It is more likely than my previous reading *t'δy (s)[ysyn](β)rwrty* since in that case traces of the bottom part of the second *s* should be visible.
[35] Cf. Gharib 1995, 321 s.v. *ptwʾyrt*.
[36] Not attested otherwise. If *xrδyʾn* may be read *Xaldāyān* it would render Syriac *kldyʾ* (*xaldāyē*), i.e., people living in southern Babylonia or Babylonian priests.
[37] Cf. note 33 and especially Sundermann 1986, 61, n. 64 = 2001, 238.
[38] Flügel 1862, 73, l. 13, cf. 103. Dodge convincingly comments that the title "very likely refers to the divine judgement" (Dodge 1970, 799, n. 282).
[39] Flügel 1862, 74, l. 5–6, cf. 103.
[40] Flügel 1862, 103, 374.
[41] Dodge 1970, 799.

and Lieu, "The dualist Epistle of Sīs."[42] If one derives the Arabic title "Letter (to) Sīsin, possessing the two images" from a Middle Persian title *Sīsin dō paikar frawardag*, it becomes obvious that *dō paikar* = *waǧhaini* means the zodiacal sign of *Gemini*.[43] *Gemini* may have been a characteristic topic of this letter, be it as the celestial constellation, or as an illustration of the communion of Mani with his spiritual twin. The *Letter (to) Abā (on) Love* and the *Letter (to) [Ba]bel* were convincingly restored and identified by Christiane Reck, the first one against my objection that pry (*frī*) means "beloved, dear" in Sogdian and not "love" which is *frītāt*. But the problem is solved once one realizes that this title, like the other ones, is Middle Persian and not Sogdian, so that the spelling in Sogdian script *pry* stands for Middle Persian *pry(y)h̲* (*friyīh*) "love." The Arabic equivalent is *Risāla Abā fi l-ḥubb*.[44] The *Letter (to) Babel* corresponds largely to an-Nadīm's *Risāla Bābil al-kabīra*, the *Great Letter (to) Babel*.[45] The correspondence would be exact if we restore *wz'rk p'pyl βrwrt'kw, Great Letter (to) Babel*.

Without equivalent in an-Nadīm's list is the title that I read as *xrδy'n(?) βrwrt'(k)[w], Letter (to) the Khaldeans*, which makes my explanation doubtful. The *Mār Sīsin – Letter*, a somewhat unspecific and problematic restoration, could stand for three letters addressed to Sīsin that are mentioned by an-Nadīm.

Another Sogdian text, M 915, listing among other works of the prophet the letters to Armenia *('rmyn (ʃ)[rwrt̰yy]* = Arabic *Risāla Arminīya)*[46] and to Sisinnios and Pattikios *(sysn pt̰yy frwrt̰y(y)* perhaps = Arabic *Risāla Sīs wa Futtaq fi ṣ-ṣuwar*),[47] was published in 1952 by Henning.[48] Further letters of Mani quoted in Iranian Manichaean texts or mentioned by name are the *Letter of the Seal (muhr dib)*,[49] the *Letter to Mēšān (on) the two bodies (frawardag Mēšūn ī dō tanwār)*,[50] the *Letter (to) the Presbyters (frawardag ī (mah)istagān = Arabic Risāla al-kubarā')*,[51] and, in the same text, the *Letter (to) Ḥaṭṭā (frawardag ī Hattā* = Arabic *Risāla*

[42] Gardner and Lieu 2004, 165.
[43] Chr. Brunner in *Encyclopædia Iranica* (London, New York, 1987), Vol. 2, 866.
[44] Flügel 1862, 74, l. 10, cf. 104.
[45] Flügel 1862, 74, l. 6, cf. 103.
[46] Flügel 1862, 73, l. 14, cf. 103.
[47] Flügel 1862, 74, l. 6–7, cf. 103.
[48] Henning 1952, 206.
[49] Henning 1937, 18 = Henning 1977, I, 432, M 720c, M 1313, So 18151.
[50] M 731 in Boyce 1975, 185.
[51] Flügel 1862, 73, l. 12, cf. 103.

Ḥaṭṭā[52]*)*,[53] and the *Big Letter (to) India (frawardag ī Hind[ūgān ī] wuzurg*[54] = Arabic *Risāla Hind al-ʿaẓīma)*.[55]

As for Mani's canonical letters, a general problem is that it is difficult and sometimes impossible to distinguish between instructive and exhortative epistles on the one hand and homiletic treatises on the other. Another problem is the reliable identification of fragments belonging to the manuscripts containing letters. The well-known variety of Manichaean writing styles is certainly a great help. But it could happen that different manuscripts were written in the same or nearly the same hand. The epistolary manuscript which I presented here is a case in point. There are some fragments (M 5098 + M 9056) with almost the same handwriting and similar contents. But similarity is not identity, and so I left those fragments out, which would be the wrong decision if one allows for the possibility that a text's writing style may slightly change from the incipit to the colophon. Therefore those texts which can safely be determined as letters may be just a minimal choice. But even so, a comprehensive edition and re-edition of Manichaean letter fragments in Iranian languages is a worth-while task for the future.

[52] Flügel 1862, 76, l. 1, cf. 104.
[53] M 733 in Boyce 1975, 184.
[54] M 1221 /p.1/ii/8–9/.
[55] Flügel 1862, 73, l. 12, cf. 103.

Appendix: The text of the collection of Middle Persian Manichaean letters

First fragment: M 5770 + M 5771 + M 5772 + M 6604. The pieces join as follows: M 5772 /pp. 1&2/1–8/, M 5771 /pp. 1&2/9–11/, M 5770 /pp. 1&2/12–16/, M 6604 /pp. 1&2/12–16/. Measures: 9.4 × 7.0 cm.

/p. 1/ 1/ [ ](st u) p(ʾ)[ ]
2/ [ ]y ʾndrz ʿy yzd[ʾn]
3/ [h](wr)wʾny<u>h</u>[56] prʾc wynʾ(r)[ ]
4/ [p](r)ʾc wynʾryd (.)[ ]
5/ [ ](.) ʾyg twyc p(d ʾm)[ ]
6/ [p](r)ʾc hrwʾgwc hyʾ(r) bʾš[ ]
7/ [ʾ](ʾ)wn twxš kw hʾn prwrdg [ ]
8/ [ ](.)[±5](wd u) ʿync ʿy dwdyg ʿyym nw(n)[ ]
9/ [ ](.)yʾy xwndn š pdyš cyydn u pd hr(w)[±1](..)[ ]
10/ [ ](g)ʾ(ry)<u>h</u> wynʾrdn u hʾmʾwxyy(h)[ʾ]
11/ [ ](ʾ)n ʾndwš prmʾ(y[57] qyr)[dn]
12/ [ ](x)[w]ʾny[hʾ](d)[58] ʾwt myzd u pʾdʾšn (ʾ)[ ]
13/ [ ](.) u (ʾmʾ)-hyc[59] pdyš hwšnwd u ʿspʾ[sdʾr]
14/ [ ] u wynyyr pd dšn ʿy drwd u hʾn yzd ʿy ʾ(.)[ ]
15/ [ ](b)rʾd ʿym grʾmyg pd hrw prʾ(rwn)[y<u>h</u>[60]]
16/ [ ](ʾw)t hrw ptyʾr wzynd u gwm(ʾ)[n]

/p. 1/ 1/ [ ] and [ ]
2/ [ ] the command of the God[s[61]]
3/ [the pi]ety[62] set forth![63] [ ]

---

[56] Hardly *](.d)wʾny<u>h</u>*. The dot over the *r* must have been torn off.
[57] Last letter covered by paper fold.
[58] Doubtful. Last letters blurred by traces of script showing through from the other side.
[59] *ʾmʾ* and *<u>h</u>yc* written separately. The bottom of the *m* is slightly displaced so that it looks like the lower part of a *z*.
[60] *rwn* partly covered by paper fold.
[61] For MP. *ʾndrz ʿy yzdʾn* cf. Parth. *ʾndrz yzdʾn* and *yzdʾn ʾndrz* (Sundermann 1997, 80–81 [§§ 73, 77] and 125).
[62] Certainly the community of the lay people (cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, 194).
[63] Or, if *wynʾd* is to be read instead of *wynʾ (r)*, "(it) will see."

4/ [ ] he will set [f]orth[64] [ ]
5/ [ ] then you also [ ]
6/ [ ]thereupon[65] be you a helper everywhere [ ]
7/ [s]o strive that that epistle[66] [ ]
8/ [ ] and also this second one which I now[send(?)]
9/ [ ] to read and to gather[67] it with it and to every [ ]
10/ [ ] to arrange and unanimous[ly]
11/ [ ] condescend to make familiar [with]
12/ [shall be] recited(?), and your reward and recompense [ ]
13/ [ ] and we too [shall be] contented and grate[ful][68] through it [ ]
14/ [ ] and arrange (it) with the right hand of well-being, and that God of [ ]
15/ [ ]my dear brother, with all righ[teousness]
16/ [ ] and to you all mischief, damage and doubt[ ]

/p. 2/1/ [ ]p'[69] gwwg[[70]]
2/ [ ]br'dr dwš[yst]
3/ [ ](.)s h'(n)yš'n pdy(.)[ ]
4/ [ ]'wd k' 'ndr[ ]
5/ [ ](w's)yšn ʿy grd(w)[n]
6/ [ ](r)d h'nd u wzrg swd u w(h)[ybg'ryẖ]
7/ [ ]'d u pd hrw xrd brhm (u)[ ]
8/ [ ]'gnyn hs'xt h'nd 'yg ps[ ]
9/ [ ]ẖ pyr'yg[71] ʿbʿc pd drystyy (u)[ ]
10/ [ ]' 'bryyt drystyẖ u (ʿ)sp[wrg'ryẖ]

---

[64] Or "you (pl.) arrange"? The restored *frāz* may simply intensify the meaning of the verb, unless it is the final part of a phrase *az…frāz* "above/after (something)."

[65] I assume that *frāz* has to be restored again and that it belongs to a construction *az…frāz* described under the previous note. Or "beyond that"?

[66] After *frawardag* a word seems to be deleted. It might have been the name of the letter.

[67] I.e. "to join it with the first letter"? For *cīdan* "gather, pile up" cf. MacKenzie 1970, 22. The other option, to translate "to mourn, lament, grieve" does not make sense in the given context.

[68] For *ispāsdār* cf. MacKenzie 1970, 76, s.v. *spās-dār*. Here *ispās* rather means "gratitude" than "service."

[69] Or *(s)* ' ?

[70] Or *gwww g(.)[* ?

[71] Hardly *pyr 'yg*, written in two words.

11/ [ ]xy(h ʾ)šnwym š pd(.)[ ]
12/ [ ](y m)-ʾny u ʾmyn(?) o/o u pwrsyn(d.)[ ]
13/ [ʿ](s)psgʾn u mhystgʾn ʿy xwʾ(š)[t](yh.)[ ]
14/ [m](h)rsrʾyʾn hmys hmʾywyn b(r)[ʾdrʾn]
15/ [h](n)zmnʾn ʾwšʾn prystʾd [ ]
16/ [p](dy)štn ywjdhr o.....8.....[ ]

/p. 2/ 1/ [ ]...?...[ ]
2/ [most] beloved brother [ ]
3/ [ ]that[72] their...?...[ ]
4/ [ ]and when in(?)[ ]
5/ [ ]the rest(?)[73] of the sky[[74]]
6/ [ ] they will be, and great benefit and improve[ment[75]]
7/ [ ] and with all behaviour of wisdom and[ ]
8/ [ ]together they will be prepared. Then after[(?)]
9/ [ ] ornament[76] again in well-being and[ ]
10/ [ ] on you well-being and com[pletion]
11/ [ ][77] I hear[78] and it [ ]

---

[72] Dem. pron.

[73] *wʾsyšn*, not attested so far, and if it is a complete word, might be a derivation from MP. **wās-* "sich beruhigen" (Weber 1970, 115), cf. *wʾsyn-* "to calm" which seems not to make very good sense, however, in the present context (and Skjærvø's "to don" does not make sense either, cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, 336). Unlikely are also "the roaring of the sky" (to Sogd. *wʾs*, Khot. *nwāśś-*) and a number of other options. Less unlikely would be a comparison with Av. *vā-* "wehen" and Sogd. *wʾs* "anfangen zu wehen" (Weber 1970, 115), but that would only be imaginable if semantic extension from "blowing" (intransitive) to "moving" or "be moved" might be assumed. In that case "the movement of the sky."

[74] For *gardūn* cf. New Persian *gardūn* "a wheel; heaven, the celestial globe or sphere; chance, fortune and her revolving wheel..." (Steingass 1963, 1081).

[75] Certainly a word beginning with *why-* "better" has to be restored. The most meaningful alternative of *whybgʾryh*, *whywn* "betterment, improvement," is attested so far only in Parthian (Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, 342).

[76] Or "decorating." Or should one read *pyr ʾyg*?

[77] The letters *ʾxyh* at the beginning of the line might be the end of *frwxyh* "fortune, prosperity" or *hʾmʾwxyh* "harmony."

[78] Or perhaps, as a late form, "we hear."

12/ [ ][79] Mani. And amen! – [80]And they ask, [ ]
13/ [the] bishops and the presbyters of peacefulness[81] [ ]
14/ [together] with the hymn-singers (and) likewise the breth[ren]
15/ [the con]gregations, And they sent [a letter to the]
16/ [ ]holy [pl]ace[82].[83] [ ]

Second fragment: M 501p + M 882c + M 1402 + M 9152. The pieces join as follows: M 1402: /pp. 1&2/1–5/, M 882c: /pp. 1&2/1–8/, M 501p: /pp. 1&2/5–8/, M 9152 /pp. 1&2/5–7/. Measures: 5.5 × 13.3 cm.

/p. 1/ 1/ [±5] kw ʾw dwšys(t)[ʾn ±2](±3)[±10]
2/ [±3](p)d rʾmyšn ʾwd drwd phryzyyd o (.)[±6]
3/ [ʾw](h) kw pd hyʾrbwdyh ʿy frystgʾn ʾšmʾh dwšy(stn)[84]
4/ [±4] (d)ryst hyd wd ʾc tn ʾʾrg syrq ʾwd prmyyn
5/ [±6](. wr)šʾn[85] (krʾn)[86] brʾd ʾwd dwst zn ʾwd rhyg bng
6/ ʾwd (qn)y(cg)[±3]nyw ʾwd dryst hʾnd ʾwd pd ʿspync ʿy

---

[79] The obvious restoration of the first letter of this line is a *y*, and this might be the end of a m(ʾ)ry "my Lord," the common title of Mani. But that would only be possible if the writer of this ending phrase was not Mani himself but a commissioned scribe or an editor of the letter. Mani himself could not possibly present his person as "my Lord."

[80] At this point two big punctuation marks indicate the end of a letter and the beginning of a new section.

[81] I.e. of the Manichaean community, esp. of the elect (cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, 366).

[82] I restore *pdyštn* which, I think, has the same meaning as Middle Persian *pdyšt* "place, home" (Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, 273). It may go back to Young Avestan *paiti-štana-* (beside *paiti-štāna-*) "Standort, Wohnstätte" (Bartholomae 1904, col. 837). It denotes either Mani's residence, a *sancta sedes* as it were, or Mani himself as the apostolic bearer of the divine revelation within the chain of prophets (cf. Henning 1934a, 27–28 = Henning 1977, I, 341–342: the ancient prophets of truth are the *pdyštʾn ʾhyngʾn*, the "former places" of the Holy Spirit).

[83] The end of the line is filled by a row of punctuation marks. There must have followed either the announced letter to Mani or immediately Mani's response.

[84] So instead of *dwšystʾn* for want of space.

[85] Uncertain reading. Only upper margins of first letters preserved. The dot in black ink above the *r* seems to be blurred by another brown dot, and only traces are visible.

[86] Uncertain. *k* (or *x*) and the final *n* clearly visible. What seems to be a dot above the *(.n)* is a small hole in the paper. Not *knʾr*, etc.

7/ ʾšmh̲ dwšystʾn nyk drwd hʾd ʾwtʾn ʾc hrwʾgwc o[87]
8/ rʾmyšn hʾd ʿyg ʾc yzdʾn nyw dybg hyb hndʾcyhyd

/p. 1/ 1/ [ ] that to the most beloved [ ]
2/ [ ] at ease and healthy you remain[88].[89] [ ]
3/ [s]o(?) that with the aid of the angels you, the most beloved,
4/ [in spirit(?)] are well, and as for the body content[90] and happy.
5/ [And at(?)] the limit(?)[91] of Georgia(?),[92] brother and friend, wife and servant, slave
6/ and maiden [all(?)] may be well and healthy.[93] And in the hostel
7/ of yours, the most beloved, there may be good well-being.[94] And from all sides
8/ there may then be for you peace from the gods,[95] and good luck may be allotted.

/p. 2/ 1/ [±8](…)[±3](š)g md kw kynz(ʾ)[±4]
2/ [±4 b](xšʾ)ynd kwmʾn cʾwn ʾc dwr pd ʾndq [±4]
3/ [ʿ]y ʾc ʾšmh̲ ptʾn zyryh̲ hwrwʾnyh̲ pryh̲ u dw(š)[ʾrmyy]
4/ ʾʾzrm ʾwd grʾmyg why bwd hym ʾygmʾn ws [±3]
5/ ʾʾwn ʾbr hndʾcyh̲ kw ʾw b(rʾdrʾn) dwš(ys)[tʾn ±5](pd)
6/ cšm ʿy nysʾhyn xwd wynyn oo oo b[yc tʾ](kʾ yk) ʾw
7/ dwdy wynym ʾyg pyštr yk nʾmg ʿy fryh̲ u dwšʾrmyh̲
8/ ʾwd dyb ʿy drwd ʾwd bwrdyšnwhryh̲ ʾwd qyrbg o

---

[87] No punctuation mark but just a space filler.

[88] 2nd Pl. A 3rd sg. would also be possible, but is less likely in view of the following *hyd* in line 4.

[89] A punctuation mark followed by an empty space might indicate the beginning of a new paragraph.

[90] Quoted in Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, 312. The reading given there is *sērag*. The unexceptional spelling with final *q* is remarkable.

[91] So far only *krʾn* "side, direction; edge, end, limit" is attested in Manichaean Parthian (Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, 208), but Pahlavi and New Persian have *karān* too. If my tentative reading is correct, it might present Georgia as the final point reached by the Manichaean mission north of Iran.

[92] Cf. my introductory remarks.

[93] From /5/ to this point the Manichaean lay-people are well-thought of, the rest of the letter concerns the elect.

[94] This may be a reference to a Manichaean monastery where the elect regularly assembled.

[95] Or: from God (Pl. majest.)?

/p. 2/ 1/ [ ] came to…?…[[96]]
2/ [they gr]ant[97] that we, when we from afar through a little [comfort(?)],
3/ which (is) from you, through your wisdom, piety, love and gentleness,
4/ honor[98] and affection,[99] have been bettered, thereupon we many [times(?)]
5/ planned that I myself with corporeal eyes might see[100]
6/ the most beloved brethren [ ].
6/ But t[ill then] that we shall see
7/ each other, before (that), [we send you] a letter of love and affection,
8/ and an epistle of salutation and gratitude and charity.

Third fragment: M 6935. Measures: 2.7 × 2.5 cm.

/p. 1/ 1/ [ ](±12)[ ]
2/ [ ](p)ryhʾn ʾwd (dw)š[ystʾn[101]]
3/ [ ](h)ʾmtng hyd[ ]
4/ [n]cyhym[102] [ ]
5/ [ ](…)[ ]

/p. 1/ 1/ [ ]
2/ [ ]beloved and [most] dear [ones]
3/ [ ]of the same body[103] you (Pl.) are[ ]
4/ [ ]I [t]each [ ]
5/ [ ]

---

[96] A word beginning with *kēn* "hate, malice, revenge"?

[97] Instead of *baxšāy-* Manichaean Middle Persian has elsewhere *baxš-*, but once also *bxšʾyšn* (M 8202 /I/R/5/, context unclear). I assume that the form belongs to New Persian *baxšāʾidan* "to bestow; to pity; to forgive" (Steingass 1963, 159), even if the New Persian word derives directly from Middle Persian *ʾbxšʾy-* "to forgive, have pity on" (which could be restored in the present context as well).

[98] To Pahlavi *āzarm* "honour, respect" (MacKenzie 1971, 15).

[99] *grāmīg* is strictly speaking an adjective "treasured, dear" (Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, 163, cf. fragment 1, /p. 1/15/), here evidently used instead of *grāmīgīh* (MacKenzie 1971, 37).

[100] The verbal form *wynyn*, not attested so far, looks like a cross of *wynym* (1st Sg. Pres. Inidic.) and *wynʾn* (1st Sg. Pres. Conj.). On the other hand a 1st Sg. Pres. Opt. expressing an illusive wish would fit the context. Cf. Lazard 1984, 4–6.

[101] Written with a very long *d* which looks rather like *z*.

[102] Or *wcyhym* (idem).

[103] Cf. Parthian *hʾmtnbʾr* (Durkin-Meisterernst 2004, 174).

/p. 2/ 1/ [ ](.)[ ]
2/ [ ](..rd) ʾwd y(z)dʾʾ[n]
3/ [ ](r)ʾn pʾdfrʾh (ʿ)[y]
4/ [ ](.) dwr ph(ryz)[yd(?)][104]

/p. 2/ 1/ [ ]
2/ [ ]…?…and god[s]
3/ [ ] punishment of the [[105]]
4/ [ ] far away remain[(?)]

Fourth fragment: M 6944. Measures: 2.3 × 4.6 cm.

/p. 1/ 1/ [pr]w(r)d(g)[y]hʾ ʾw ʾšmʾ(h)[ ]
2/ [ ](n) kym ʾb(ʾ)g xwyš gy(ʾ)[n]
3/ [ ](ʾ)byr rwšn pydʾg o [[106]]
4/ [ ](. frzyndʾ)n ʿy (pr)y(st)[g]

/p. 1/ 1/ [let]ters[107] to you (Pl.)[ ]
2/ [ ] whom I, together with my own Sou[l]
3/ [ ]…?…light visible. [ ]
4/ [ ] children of the Apostl[e[108]]

/p. 2/ 1/ [ ](.)w (…)wgyy[109] wy(…g)[ ]
2/ [ ](ʿ)y ʾrwʾnʾn (r)[ʾ]y (m)ʾzy(nd)[r]
3/ [ ]d byš ʾwd ʾqʾmg ʾw(d..)[ ]
4/ [ ](.ʾ)g mʾ(zy)ndrʾ[n] ʾwd (…)[ ]

[104] Following line empty.
[105] May the *](r)ʾn* at the beginning of line 3 be restored as *mʾzyndrʾn* who are mentioned in the fourth fragment?
[106] End of line empty.
[107] Plural formation with the late Middle Persian ending *-īhā* instead of *-ān*. Or as an adverb "by letter"?
[108] Or Apostles?
[109] I regret not to be able to give a plausible reading and translation of this relatively well readable word: first letter *k* or *x*, second: *w* or *k* or *x*, third: *d* or *r*.

/p. 2/ 1/ [ ]
2/ [ ] for [ ] of the souls the *Māzendar*[*ān*[110]]
3/ [ ] pain and unwilling and [ ]
4/ [ ] *Māzendarān* and [ ]

It seems possible that the third and fourth fragment belong to one and the same sheet and preserve parts of the same lines of text without joining, however. The matching parts are lines 1 to 4 on both sides. They can be arranged as follows:

/p. 1/ 1/ [pr]w(r)d(g)[y]hʾ ʾw ʾšmʾ(h)[ ]
2/ [ ](p)ryhʾn ʾwd (dw)š[ystʾ](n) kym ʾb(ʾ)g xwyš gy(ʾ)[n]
3/ [ ](h)ʾmtng hyd [hʾm](ʾ)byr rwšn pydʾg o [ ]
4/ [n]cyhym [±6](przyndʾ)n ʿy (pr)y(st)[g]

/p. 1/ 1/ [ ]letters to you[ ]
2/ [ ]beloved and dearest ones whom I together with my own soul [ ]
3/ [ ]being of one body [you are] a visible [tow]er of light. [ ]
4/ [ ] I [t]each [ ] children of the Apostl[e]

/p. 2/ 1/ [ ](.)w (…)wgyy wy(…)[ ]
2/ [ ](ʿ)y ʾrwʾnʾn (r)[ʾ]y mʾzy(nd)[rʾn.](..rd) ʾwd y(z)dʾʾ[n]
3/ [ ]d byš ʾwd ʾqʾmg ʾwd (mʾ)[zynd](r)ʾn pʾdfrʾh (ʿ)[y]
4/ [ ](.ʾ)g mʾ(zy)ndrʾ[n] ʾwd (…)[±5](.) dwr ph(ryz)[yd]

/p. 2/ 1/ [ ]
2/ [ ] for the [ ] of the souls he [ ] the *Māzendarān* and the gods [ ]
3/ [with] pain and unwillingly, and the [ ] punishment of the *Māzendarān* [ ]
4/ [from] the *Māzendarān* and [ ] keep away![111] [ ].

---

[110] The demonic archonts and "watchers" imprisoned in the skies (cf. Sundermann 2001, 699).

[111] Or: he keeps, they keep away, etc.?

Bibliography

Alfaric, P.
1919 *Les écritures manichéennes II* (Paris).
Andreas, F. C. and W. [B.] Henning
1934 Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, III. *SPAW*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1934: 846–912.
Asmussen, J. P.
1982 A Zoroastrian 'De-Demonization' in Judeo-Persian, *Irano-Judaica* 1982: 112–121.
Bartholomae, Chr.
1904 *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (Strassburg).
Boyce, M.
1960 *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichean Script in the German Turfan Collection* (Berlin).
1968 The Manichaean Literature in Middle Iranian, *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, 1. Abt., 4. Bd., 2. Abschnitt, Lieferung 1 (Leiden, Köln): 67–76.
1975 *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, Acta Iranica 9 (Leiden).
Dodge, B.
1970 *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm* (New York, London).
Durkin-Meisterernst, D.
2004 *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Dictionary of Manichaean Texts III (Turnhout).
Feldmann, E.
1987 *Die „Epistula Fundamenti" der nordafrikanischen Manichäer* (Altenberge).
Flügel, G.
1862 *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften* (Leipzig).
Funk, W. P.
1997 The reconstruction of the Manichaean *Kephalaia*, *Emerging from Darkness. Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn, eds. (Leiden), 143–159.
1999 *Kephalaia I, zweite Hälfte*, *Lieferung 13/14* (Stuttgart).
Gardner, I.
1997 Personal letters from the Manichaean community at Kellis, *Atti del Terzo Congressio Internazionale di Studi "Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico*, L. Cirillo and A. van Tongerloo, eds. (Lovanii, Napoli), 77–94.
2001 The reconstruction of Mani's *Epistles* from three Coptic codices, *The Light and the Darkness. Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn, eds. (Leiden), 93–104.
Gardner, I., A. Alcock, W.-P. Funk
1999 *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis* I (Oxford-Oakville).
Gardner, I., S. N. C. Lieu
2004 *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire* (Cambridge).
Gharib, B.
1995 *Sogdian Dictionary. Sogdian – Persian – English* (Tehran).
Gignoux, Ph.
1972 *Glossaire des Inscriptions Pehlevies et Parthes*, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Suppl. Ser. I (London).
Henning, W. B.
1934 Ein manichäisches Henochbuch, *SPAW*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1934, 5: 27–35.
1937 *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch*, APAW, Phil.-hist. Kl., 10 (Berlin).
1945 Waručān-Šāh, *Journal of the Greater India Society* 11: 85–90.

1947 Two Manichæan Magical Texts with an Excursus on The Parthian ending *-ēndēh*, *BSOAS* 12: 39–66.
1977 *Selected Papers* I–II, Acta Iranica 14–15 (Leiden).

Henning, W. B. and G. Haloun
1952 The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light, *Asia Major*, ns, 3: 184–212.

MacKenzie, D. N.
1971 *A concise Pahlavi Dictionary* (London).

Reck, Chr.
2006 *Mitteliranische Handschriften I, Berliner Turfanfragmente manichäischen Inhalts in soghdischer Schrift* (Stuttgart).

Robinson, J. M.
1992 The fate of the Manichaean codices of Medinet Madi, *Studia Manichaica. II. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus*, G. Wießner, H.-J. Klimkeit, eds. (Wiesbaden), 19–62.

Schmidt, C. and H. J. Polotsky
1933 Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten, *SPAW*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1933: 1–89.

Stein, M.
1998 *Manichaica Latina 1, epistula ad Menoch* (Wiesbaden).
2002 *Manichaica Latina 2, Manichaei epistula fundamenti* (Paderborn).

Steingass, F.
1963 *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary* (London [repr. of 1892 ed.]).

Sundermann, W.
1974 Iranische Lebensbeschreibungen Manis, *Acta Orientalia (Havniensia)* 36: 125–149.
1984 Probleme der Interpretation manichäisch-soghdischer Briefe, *From Hecataeus to Al-Ḥuwārizmī*, J. Harmatta, ed. (Budapest), 289–316.
1986 Studien zurkirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer, I–II, *AoF* 13: 40–92, 239–317.
2001 *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften*, I–II, Chr. Reck, D. Weber, Cl. Leurini, A. Panaino, eds. (Roma).
2007 Eine Re-Edition zweier manichäisch-soghdischer Briefe, *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*, ed. M. Macuch, M. Maggi, W. Sundermann (Wiesbaden), 403–421.

Weber, D.
1970 *Die Stellung der sog. Inchoativa im Mitteliranischen* (Göttingen).

Yoshida, Y. *et al.*
2000 *Studies in the new Manichaean texts recovered from Turfan* (Beijing).

INDEX

Abe Takeo 62, 68
Abû'l faradj 110
Acta Archelai 74
Acts of Thomas 58–59
Adda 6–7
Alcock, A. 260
Alfaric, Prosper 103, 107, 170, 263
Amin, al- 139–140
Amita Sūtra 201
Ammō 206
Andrea of Perugia 192
Apocalypse of Adam 53, 55
Arat, R. R. 71
Arda Wirāz nāmag 82
Ārdhang 88
Ārdhang wifrās 253–254
Asmussen, J. 76, 78, 79–80, 84, 93, 262
Aubineau, Michel 31–33
Augustine of Hippo (incl. his works) 1–28, 37, 50, 73, 82, 88, 94, 103–113, 169, 260
Āyīn l'-Ardašīr 91

Babylonian Talmud 82
Baraies 45
Bardenhewer, Otto 31
Barmakids 135–140
Bartholomae, Ch. 83, 221, 271
Baruch, Book of 56–57
Baur, F. C. 112
Beausobre, I. de 109
Beck, H. 30–31, 34
Beck, H.-G. 30
BeDuhn, Jason 6, 19, 27, 103, 125, 146, 169, 170, 237
Bennett, Byard 32
Bet- und Beichtbuch (*BBB*) 84, 85, 225–226, 237
Betz, H. D. 107
Biruni, al- 77, 132, 246
Bistami, Bayazid al- 140
Blois, F. de 77, 175
Böhlig, A. 49, 73, 79, 80, 112, 116
Bousset, W. 113
Bovon, F. 51
Boyce, Mary 175, 207, 209, 213, 215, 226–227, 260–261, 266–267
Brandt, W. 45
Brockelmann, C. 139
Browne, E. G. 129, 130–131
Bruce, L. D. 104
Brunner, Ch. 266
Bryder, Peter 184–185, 189, 207
Bügü Khan 61–62, 68–70
Bultmann, R. 56
Busti, Abu'l-Qasim al- 139

Cantera-Glera, A. 90
Carneades 9–11, 24
Ch5554+Ch/U6914+So15000(5) 75
Ch/So20501+Ch/U6546 216–217
Ch/So20507b 237
Chappell, David 201
Chavannes, Éduard 3
Chen Yuan 182, 183
Chwolson, D. 196
Cicero 2, 9–12, 14, 16, 19–21, 23, 26
Čīdag handarz ī pōryōtkēšān 88–89, 92
Clark, Larry 61, 69–70, 237, 247
Clitomachus 9
Colditz, Iris 74, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 92, 241
Cologne Mani Codex (*CMC*) 45–46, 50–51, 56, 58, 115–116, 118–119, 126
Compendium 80, 88, 213, 248
Contemplation Sūtra 203, 204
Cope, Glenn Melvin 34
Coyle, J. Kevin 101, 106, 107, 113
Cumont, F. 46
Czeglédy, K. 67

Darrouzès, J. 32
Decret, François 2, 5, 7, 8, 24, 101–114, 170
Dēnkard 83, 89, 94
ps.-Didymus 33
Dodge, B. 263, 265
Drijvers, Han J. 59
Drower, E. S. 125
Dschi Hiän-lin 251
Durkin-Meisterernst, Desmond 213, 228, 245, 268, 270–273
Dyobouniotes, Konstantinos 31
Džumagulov, Č. 196–197

Ebert, Jorinde 148, 190, 253
Eccles, Lance 194, 195, 197
Ecke, Gustave 191, 193
Eismann, Katrin 145, 149
Elchasaites 45, 47, 54, 56, 118–121, 170
Enoch, Books of 48
Epiphanius (incl. his works) 53, 56–57
Epistula Fundamenti 50, 88, 107, 218, 260
Eulogy of the Light-world 205–209
Evodius of Uzala 104, 113

Faustus of Milevis 1–28, 103–104, 106, 108–112
Feldmann, E. 107, 109, 110, 113, 260
Felix 106
Festugière, A. J. 46
Fihrist of an-Nadim 73, 76, 77, 78, 86, 88, 92, 129, 131–132, 138, 140, 143–144, 259, 263, 265–267
Flügel, G. 110, 263, 265
Fortunatus of Hippo 106, 107, 108, 110–111
Foster, John 192
Franzmann, Majella 196, 197
Frend, W. H. C. 106, 107, 108, 110, 113
Fujita Kōtatsu 202–203
Funk, Wolf-Peter 260

Gabain, A. von 63
Gardner, Iain 193, 227, 260, 263
Gathas 90, 92, 94
Geerlings, W. 110
Geng Shimin 64, 196, 251
Gharib, B. 172, 209
Giants, Book of 107, 213, 247
Gignoux, Ph. 262
Gospel of Truth 53
Great Hymn to Mani 247
Greenhalgh, Michael 146
Gregory of Nyssa 33
Grignaschi, M. 91
Grondijs, Lodewijk 102, 108–114
Gulácsi, Zsuzsanna 147, 157, 164, 189, 247
Gyān wifrās 92

Hallaj, al- 129–131, 142–144
Halleux, A. de 32
Haloun, G. 213, 226, 229
Hamilton, J. 64–66, 198–199
Hananishu, Mar 197
Handarz ī Ādurbād ī Mahraspandān 89
Harnack, Adolf von 51
Harrison, G. 103, 169, 170
Harun ar-Rashid 136–140
Hazār dādestān 82
Henning, W. B. 49, 78, 79, 80, 82, 84, 87, 88, 92, 173, 174, 176, 207, 209, 213, 225–226, 228, 229, 241, 245, 247–248, 259, 261–263, 266, 271
Henrichs, A. 50–51, 53
Heraclion 55–56
Hērbedestān 91
Hertel, J. 251
Hoeck, J. M. 31
Homilies 213
Hsüan Tsang 138
Humbach, H. 90, 94
Hunter, Erica 125
Hutter, M. 176
Huyadagmān 207–208
Hymnscroll 73, 85, 171, 204–206, 208–209

Iamblichus 46
Irenaeus 47, 52

Jacob of Ancona 186
Jahiz, al- 135, 137, 140
John of Caesarea (the Grammarian) 31–32
John of Damascus 30–32
John of Montecorvino 192
Jonas, H. 53
Jugie, Martin 30–31
Justin (the Gnostic) 56–57
Juvaini 63–64, 66

Kalila wa Dimna 251
Karabalgassun Inscription 69–70, 80
Kasai Yukiyo 62–65, 68, 228, 251
Kauz, R. 187, 188
Kephalaia 73, 77, 78, 84, 87, 109–110, 112–113, 122, 199, 246, 248, 259
Khaldun, ibn 138–139
King, K. 116, 121
Klein, Wolfgang Wassilios 32, 196
Klíma, O. 82
Klimkeit, H.-J. 73, 92, 93, 147, 173, 196, 207, 209, 251
Knibb, M. A. 48
Koenen, Ludwig 50–51, 120, 169, 170
Koschorke, K. 54

L44 249
Laffan, M. 265
Lagarde, P. A. de 34
Langen, Joseph 30, 34
Laut, J.-P. 196, 251
Lazard, G. 273
Le Coq, A. von 61, 62, 65, 147, 148, 207, 247
Lee, Kam-lun Edwin 3
Lentz, W. 117, 209
Letter of the Seal 226–227, 231–232, 237–238
Letters (of Mani) 107, 213, 259–267
Leurini, C. 176
Lieu, Samuel N. C. 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 169, 170, 183, 189, 194, 197, 199, 227, 260, 263
Lim, Richard 101–102, 107
Lin Wenming 189
Lin Wushu 181, 209
Living Gospel 107, 116–123, 213, 218, 226–227, 259
Lof, L. J. van der 77, 113
Lüthi, M. 250

M1 80, 84
M7 91
M11 173
M14 172
M17 218
M37 173
M39 74
M42 246
M49 78, 83–84, 86
M52 227
M61 227
M77 75
M95 91–92
M101a–n 247
M101f 80
M114 85, 247
M129 246
M135 87–88, 92, 93
M178 171–176, 208
M183 II+M3404 175
M209 213
M258 253
M299a 248
M333 83
M378 237
M379b 218–220
M410 237
M454 226
M496a 91
M501p 261, 271–273
M548 174
M564 91–92
M608b 215–217
M644 218
M720c 226
M729 173
M731 266
M733 267
M738 172–173
M782 84
M798a 172
M801a 73, 226, 228–231
M882c 261, 271–273
M895b 215–217
M895e 216
M911 247
M915 266–267
M1221 267
M1312 227–231, 238
M1313 226–231, 238
M1402 261, 271–273
M1876 91–92
M1877 91–92
M1963 91
M5770 261, 268–271
M5771 261, 268–271
M5772 261, 268–271
M5779 84, 237
M5098+M9056 267
M5860 78–79
M6020 80
M6330 247–248
M6470 252
M6604 261, 268–271
M6935 261, 273–274
M6944 261, 274–275
M7981 174
M8202 273
M8251 81
M9152 261, 271–273
MacKenzie, D. N. 218, 269, 273
MacKerras, C. 71
Macuch, M. 82, 83
Ma'mun, al- 139–140
Mandaeans 125–126
Marcion 51
Marco Polo 181, 186, 191, 195
Mason, Herbert 129
Massignon, Louis 129–131, 143–144
Mas'udi 138
Maximus (the Confessor) 32–33
Mazdak, Book of 137
Meer, F. van den 110

Menander 47
Ménard, J. 53
Menasce, J. de 89, 169
Merkelbach, R. 45, 103, 170
MIK III 4859 164
MIK III 4947+III 5d 161, 163–164, 247
MIK III 4959 152, 155, 159
MIK III 4970c 247
MIK III 4971 157
MIK III 4974 146, 172
MIK III 4979 148, 152, 153, 155, 157
MIK III 4990 171
MIK III 6257 152, 153
MIK III 6258a 152
MIK III 6279a–h 253
MIK III 6286 155, 189
MIK III 6368 153
MIK III 7283 152
MIK III 8259 153, 155, 157, 164, 250
Mikkelsen, Gunner 204, 205
Milik, J. T. 48
Miller, Mary 146
Minshu of He Qiaoyuan 182, 187, 188
Mirecki, P. 117
Monastery Scroll 93
Monceaux, P. 103
Morano, Enrico 117, 214–215, 225–226, 228
Moriyasu Takao 67, 182, 195
Mosher, David 20–21
Moule, A. C. 191
Mourant, John 16
Mukhtar ibn Abu ʿUbayd ath-Thaqafi 132–135
Muqtadir, al- 129–131, 139, 142
Murayama S. 194
Muʿtazz, ʿAbu-lʿAbbas ibn al- 130–132, 142
Mysteries, Book of 107, 213

Naassenes 56
Nērangestān 91
Niu Ruji 194–199

Odes of Solomon 55
O'Donnell, James 15
Omont, H. 170
Oort, Johannes van 2, 28, 170
Origen 55
Otani 6151 228–231
Oxyrhynchus 1 52
Oxyrhynchus 654 52
Oxyrhynchus 655 52
Oxyrhynchus 840 51

Pacioni, Vergilio 13
Padnāmag ī Zardušt 88–89
Pahlavi Rivāyat of the Dādestān i dēnīg 83
Panaino, A. 172, 174, 176
Parable Book 241
Paraphrase of Shem 54
Parry, Kenneth 193
Pas, Julian 201, 202
Paul (the Persian) 32
PC2988 65
Pedersen, Nils Arne 34, 112, 113, 213
Pelliot, Paul 3, 182, 183
Pettipiece, Timothy 122
Philip, Gospel of 52
Philo of Larissa 9–10, 23
Photinus (the Manichaean) 32
Picture-Book 88, 213
Pierre, M. J. 55
Pistis Sophia 55
Polotsky, H. J. 78, 88
Possidius 106
Pragmateia 46, 88, 107, 213, 253–254
Psalm-Book 73, 79, 87, 119, 126, 171, 208–209, 213
Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions 47–49
Puech, H.-Ch. 31, 52, 169
Pulleyblank, E. G. 66, 67

Rachmati, G. R. 63
Ranke, K. 251
Reck, Christiane 78, 79, 80, 84, 93, 207, 214–216, 225, 227, 264, 266
Reeves, John C. 48, 49, 246
Resch, A. 55
Richard, Marcel 31–32
Ries, J. 112–113
Right Ginza 125
Robinson, J. 116, 260
Rochow, I. 31
Römer, C. 50, 120
Rose, Eugen 109, 110, 112–113
Rudolph, Kurt 45, 125

SI D/17 65–66
Šābuhragān 91–92, 107, 246, 253
Sacchi, P. 48
Šahrastānī, al- 246
Säve-Söderbergh, Torgny 126
Sampsaeans 56
Sander, Lore 189

Saturninus 47
Šāyist-nē-šāyist 94
Schaeder, H. H. 88
Schmidt, C. 88, 259–260
Schmidt-Glintzer, H. 204
Scholarius, Gennadios 32–33
Seah, Ingram 201
Selbourne, D. 186
Senga, T. 66–67
Sermon of the Gospel 117
Sermon of the Light-Nous 176
Sermon of the Soul 250
Sethians 57
Sextus Empiricus 11
Shaked, Sh. 83, 89
Shandao 201
Shi Pingting 201
Sieg, E. 251
Simon (the Magician) 46
Simonetti, M. 32
Sims-Williams, Nicholas 73, 74, 76, 86, 93, 196, 207, 229–231, 243, 249
Sinnige, Theo 104
Skjaervø, P. O. 253, 270
So10200(5) 248–249
So10700b+So10701b 85
So13500 79
So14150 225–226, 228–232, 238
So14151 225, 232–234, 238
So14152 225–226, 228–232, 238
So14152a 225, 231, 238
So14153 225, 232, 235–236, 238
So14154 225, 232, 238
So14155 225, 231–234, 238
So14156 225–226, 228–232, 238
So14157 225, 232, 238
So14158 225, 231–232, 235–236, 238
So14159 225–226, 232–234, 238
So14187+So14190 249
So14570 214–215
So15502 264
So18056 226
So18058 241–245
So18140+So13425(1) 237
So18151 226
So18197 241–245
So18248 245
So18300 87
Solomon, Mar 193–196
Stausberg, M. 93, 94
Stein, M. 103, 260
Steingass, F. 270, 273
Stern, S. 140
Stiefenhofer, Dionys 31
Stoop, E. de 113
Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra, Larger 202, 205
Sukhāvatīvyūhasūtra, Smaller 202, 204
Sundermann, Werner 7, 77, 78, 79, 80, 83, 84, 87, 88, 92, 169, 170, 175, 176, 189, 206, 207, 213, 226, 237, 241, 243, 244, 246, 250, 252–253, 262, 264–265, 268, 275
Synaxeis Codex 116–124, 126

T II D 91 225
T III D 271k 264
Tabari, al- 138
Taiping kuangji 182
T'ang Hui-yao 66
Tardieu, M. 45, 73, 76, 79, 80, 88, 102, 112, 170
Tarrant, Harold 10
Tebessa Codex 103, 108, 170
Tertullian 49
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs 49
Testimony of Truth 54, 58
Theodore bar Khōni 46, 246–247
Theodoret of Cyrrhus 29, 34–44
Thierry, F. 67–68
Thomas, Gospel of 51–52, 58
Thomas, J. 45
Titus of Bostra 29, 34–44
TM47 (*M919*) 71
TM417 71
Tongerloo, A. van 170, 195
Traité Pelliot 75, 205
Treasury of Life 107, 213, 259
Troje, L. 250
Tsukamoto Zenryū 201
Tubach, J. 174, 175, 176

U01 61–64, 66–70
U64a+Mainz435b 65, 247
U72 69
U73 69
U140 237
U251a 65
U971 64

Valentinians 52–53
Van Fleteren, Frederick 23
Van der Loon, Piet 184
Vidēvdād 89–90, 94

Waldschmidt, E. 117, 209
Wang Lianmao 193
Weber, D. 270
Widengren, Geo 169, 170, 172

Wilkens, J. 65, 237, 241, 247
Wu Wenliang 183–184, 188, 190–193, 195
Wu Yuxiong 192–193
Wurst, G. 78, 79, 103, 112, 248
Wuzurgān Āfrīwan 214–215

Xinxiu wangshen zhuan 201–202
Xwāstwānīft 73, 78, 84–86, 92, 93, 248

Yabuki Keiki 202
Yasna 90–91, 94
Yoshida Yutaka 264
Younger Avesta 94

Zand ī Wahman Yasn 249–250
Zhuang Weiji 183–184
Zieme, Peter 64, 65, 207, 237

Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
(www.brill.nl/nhms)

1. Scholer, D.M. *Nag Hammadi bibliography, 1948-1969*. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02603 7
2. Ménard, J.-E. *L'évangile de vérité*. Traduction française, introduction et commentaire par J.-É. Ménard. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03408 0
3. Krause, M. (ed.). *Essays on the Nag Hammadi texts in honour of Alexander Böhlig*. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03535 4
4. Böhlig, A. & F. Wisse, (eds.). *Nag Hammadi Codices III, 2 and IV, 2. The Gospel of the Egyptians*. (The Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit). Edited with translation and commentary, in cooperation with P. Labib. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04226 1
5. Ménard, J.-E. *L'Évangile selon Thomas*. Traduction française, introduction, et commentaire par J.-É. Ménard. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04210 5
6. Krause, M. (ed.). *Essays on the Nag Hammadi texts in honour of Pahor Labib*. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04363 2
7. Ménard, J.-E. *Les textes de Nag Hammadi*. Colloque du centre d'Histoire des Religions, Strasbourg, 23-25 octobre 1974. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04359 4
8. Krause, M. (ed.). *Gnosis and Gnosticism*. Papers read at the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies. Oxford, September 8th-13th, 1975. 1977. ISBN 90 04 05242 9
9. Schmidt, C. (ed.). *Pistis Sophia*. Translation and notes by V. MacDermot. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05635 1
10. Fallon, F.T. *The enthronement of Sabaoth*. Jewish elements in Gnostic creation myths. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05683 1
11. Parrott, D.M. *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05798 6
12. Koschorke, K. *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum*. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Nag Hammadi-Traktate 'Apokalypse des Petrus' (NHC VII, 3) und 'Testimonium Veritatis' (NHC IX, 3). 1978. ISBN 90 04 05709 9
13. Schmidt, C. (ed.). *The Books of Jeu and the untitled text in the Bruce Codex*. Translation and notes by V. MacDermot. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05754 4
14. McL. Wilson, R. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis*. Papers read at the First International Congress of Coptology (Cairo, December 1976). 1978. ISBN 90 04 05760 9
15. Pearson, B.A. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06377 3
16. Barns, J.W.B., G.M. Browne, & J.C. Shelton, (eds.). *Nag Hammadi Codices*. Greek and Coptic papyri from the cartonnage of the covers. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06277 7
17. Krause, M. (ed.). *Gnosis and Gnosticism*. Papers read at the Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies. Oxford, September 3rd-8th, 1979. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06399 4
18. Helderman, J. *Die Anapausis im Evangelium Veritatis*. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung des valentinianisch-gnostischen Heilsgutes der Ruhe im Evangelium Veritatis und in anderen Schriften der Nag-Hammadi Bibliothek. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07260 8
19. Frickel, J. *Hellenistische Erlösung in christlicher Deutung*. Die gnostische Naassenerschrift. Quellen, kritische Studien, Strukturanalyse, Schichtenscheidung, Rekonstruktion der Anthropos-Lehrschrift. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07227 6

20-21. Layton, B. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7, together with XIII, 2* Brit. Lib. Or. 4926(1) and P. Oxy. 1, 654, 655*. I. Gospel according to Thomas, Gospel according to Philip, Hypostasis of the Archons, Indexes. II. On the origin of the world, Expository treatise on the Soul, Book of Thomas the Contender. 1989. 2 volumes. ISBN 90 04 09019 3

22. Attridge, H.W. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex I* (The Jung Codex). I. Introductions, texts, translations, indices. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07677 8
23. Attridge, H.W. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex I* (The Jung Codex). II. Notes. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07678 6
24. Stroumsa, G.A.G. *Another seed. Studies in Gnostic mythology*. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07419 8
25. Scopello, M. *L'exégèse de l'âme*. Nag Hammadi Codex II, 6. Introduction, traduction et commentaire. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07469 4
26. Emmel, S. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex III, 5*. The Dialogue of the Savior. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07558 5
27. Parrott, D.M. (ed.) *Nag Hammadi Codices III, 3-4 and V, 1 with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502,3 and Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1081*. Eugnostos and the Sophia of Jesus Christ. 1991. ISBN 90 04 08366 9
28. Hedrick, C.W. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codices XI, XII, XIII*. 1990. ISBN 90 04 07825 8
29. Williams, M.A. *The immovable race*. A gnostic designation and the theme of stability in Late Antiquity. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07597 6
30. Pearson, B.A. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex VII*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10451 8

31. Sieber, J.H. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex VIII*. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09477 6
32. Scholer, D.M. *Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1970-1994*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 09473 3
33. Wisse, F. & M. Waldstein, (eds.). *The Apocryphon of John*. Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,1; and IV,1 with BG 8502,2. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10395 3
34. Lelyveld, M. *Les logia de la vie dans l'Evangile selon Thomas*. A la recherche d'une tradition et d'une rédaction. 1988. ISBN 90 04 07610 7
35. Williams, F. (Tr.). *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Book I (Sects 1-46). 1987. Reprint 1997. ISBN 90 04 07926 2
36. Williams, F. (Tr.). *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Books II and III (Sects 47-80, *De Fide*). 1994. ISBN 90 04 09898 4
37. Gardner, I. *The Kephalaia of the Teacher*. The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation with Commentary. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10248 5
38. Turner, M.L. *The Gospel according to Philip*. The Sources and Coherence of an Early Christian Collection. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10443 7
39. van den Broek, R. *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10654 5
40. Marjanen, A. *The Woman Jesus Loved*. Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10658 8
41. Reeves, J.C. *Heralds of that Good Realm*. Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10459 3
42. Rudolph, K. *Gnosis & spätantike Religionsgeschichte*. Gesammelte Aufsätze. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10625 1
43. Mirecki, P. & J. BeDuhn, (eds.). *Emerging from Darkness*. Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10760 6
44. Turner, J.D. & A. McGuire, (eds.). *The Nag Hammadi Library after Fifty Years*. Proceedings of the 1995 Society of Biblical Literature Commemoration. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10824 6
45. Lieu, S.N.C. *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China*. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10405 4
46. Heuser, M & H.-J. Klimkeit. *Studies in Manichaean Literature and Art*. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10716 9
47. Zöckler, T. *Jesu Lehren im Thomasevangelium*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11445 9
48. Petersen, S. *"Zerstört die Werke der Weiblichkeit!"*. Maria Magdalena, Salome und andere Jüngerinnen Jesu in christlich-gnostischen Schriften. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11449 1
49. Van Oort, J. , O. Wermelinger & G. Wurst (eds.). *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht International Symposium of the IAMS. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11423 8
50. Mirecki, P. & J. BeDuhn (eds.). *The Light and the Darkness*. Studies in Manichaeism and its World. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11673 7
51. Williams, F.E. *Mental Perception*. A Commentary on NHC, VI,4: The Concept of Our Great Power. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11692 3
52. Pleše, Z. *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe*. Narrative and Cosmology in the *Apocryphon of John*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 11674 5
53. Scopello, M. *Femme, Gnose et manichéisme*. De l'espace mythique au territoire du réel. 2005. ISBN 90 04 11452 1
54. Bethge, H., S. Emmel, K.L. King, & I. Schletterer (eds.). *For the Children, Perfect Instruction*. Studies in Honor of Hans-Martin Schenke on the Occasion of the Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften's Thirtieth Year. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12672 4
55. Van Oort, J. (ed.). *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica. Collected Essays of Gilles Quispel*. With additional Prefaces by A. DeConick & J.-P. Mahé. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 13945 9
56. Pedersen, N., *Demonstrative Proof in Defence of God*. A Study of Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos* – The Work's Sources, Aims and Relation to its Contemporary Theology. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13883 8
57. Gulácsi, Z. *Mediaeval Manichaean Book Art*. A Codicological Study of Iranian and Turkic Illuminated Book Fragments from 8th-11th Century East Central Asia. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13994 X
58. Luttikhuizen, G.P. *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14510 9
59. Asgeirsson, J.M., A.D. DeConick & R. Uro (eds.). *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity*. The Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14779 9
60. Thomassen, E., *The Spiritual Seed – The Church of the 'Valentinians'*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14802 7
61. BeDuhn, J. & P. Mirecki (eds.). *Frontiers of Faith*. The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelaus. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16180 1
62. Scopello, M. (ed.). *The Gospel of Judas in Context*. Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Gospel of Judas *Paris, Sorbonne, October 27th-28th, 2006*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16721 6
63. Williams, F. (tr.). *The* Panarion *of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book I*. (Sects 1-46) Second Edition, Revised and Expanded. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17017 9
64. BeDuhn, J.D. (ed.). *New Light on Manichaeism*. Papers from the Sixth International Congress on Manichaeism. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17285 2
65. Scholer, D.M. *Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1995-2006*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17240 1

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS
1683
BRILL